





Miss Virgin Evans

Cairo Ill







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2022 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation

<https://archive.org/details/doublecureorrede0000dote>

THE DOUBLE CURE  
OR  
REDEMPTION TWOFOLD

BY  
D. O. TEASLEY

---

GOSPEL TRUMPET COMPANY  
ANDERSON, INDIANA

Copyright, 1916,  
by  
Gospel Trumpet Company

## PREFACE

To make clear the subject of full redemption by two works of divine grace is the object of this book. The nature of the subject is such that a didactic style is required throughout its treatment; the reader, therefore, will expect simplicity and thought rather than eloquence and emotion.

I have tried to be both brief and thorough, but have found it no easy task to treat an intricate and extended subject briefly, thoroughly, and clearly.

Most earnestly of all, I have endeavored to prove every assertion in this book either by a particular text or by the tenor of the Scriptures as a whole. How well I have accomplished this, and my other desires relative to this work, my readers may judge.

Trusting that The Double Cure may clear up the subject of twofold redemption in many minds and lead at least a few souls into the spiritual land of promise, I commit my efforts to my readers and to God.

D. O. Teasley.

*Bessemer, Ala.*



## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	9
CHAPTER I	
Man's Original Purity.....	23
CHAPTER II	
Man Under Law.....	30
CHAPTER III	
The Temptation and the Fall.....	36
CHAPTER IV	
The Nature of the Penalty.....	41
CHAPTER V	
Immediate Consequences of the Fall..	49
CHAPTER VI	
Moral Effects of Adam's Sin on His Posterity .....	52
CHAPTER VII	
Nature of Native Depravity.....	59
CHAPTER VIII	
Extent of Native Depravity.....	64
CHAPTER IX	
Theories of Native Depravity.....	68
CHAPTER X	
History of the Doctrine of Native Depravity .....	73
CHAPTER XI	
Modal Theories of Native Depravity..	76
CHAPTER XII	
Consequences of the Fall Reviewed...	87

	CHAPTER XIII
A Double Need.....	91
	CHAPTER XIV
Justification .....	93
	CHAPTER XV
Native Depravity in the Justified Believer .....	96
	CHAPTER XVI
Sanctification Defined .....	105
	CHAPTER XVII
Christian Perfection .....	113
	CHAPTER XVIII
Sanctification a Cleansing.....	115
	CHAPTER XIX
Sanctification a Second Work.....	123
	CHAPTER XX
Sanctification a Reception of the Holy Spirit .....	134
	CHAPTER XXI
Mode of Sanctification.....	141
	CHAPTER XXII
Sanctification Attainable in This Life..	144
	CHAPTER XXIII
Who May Have Sanctification?.....	147
	CHAPTER XXIV
The Value of Sanctification.....	149
	CHAPTER XXV
How to Obtain Sanctification.....	152

# Introduction

Before approaching the main subject of this book, reader and author need to become sufficiently acquainted that the reader may clearly understand the author's object and know the subject of this book with its intended limitations.

By "double cure" is meant the remedy for man's acquired sins and for his native depravity. It is not the purpose of this book to present an exhaustive discussion of the plan of redemption in all the phases of that subject. Such is the sphere of theological works, not of a condensed treatise. Yet it is believed that this book will be found a thorough, defensive Biblical presentation of the primary doctrine of redemption in the applied sense of the word "redemption."

Before we enter upon the discussion of our subject, two things are particularly necessary: (1) That we agree upon some standard of judgment that will constitute a common ground as a starting-point for our reasoning; (2) That we carefully de-

fine the principal terms that we intend to employ.

#### STANDARD OF JUDGMENT

It is useless to reason unless we can find some common standard by which to test the ideas that we present as proof of our premises. For example: if you should insist upon the Koran, the book of Mohammed, as a standard, and I should contend that the Book of Mormon is the only true standard, then a lifetime of reasoning would not bring us to a conclusion satisfactory to us both; but if we can agree that the Bible, the book of Christianity, is the only perfect standard of judgment in religion, we shall have room to hope that we may see alike and "flow together." The Bible is taken as the standard of judgment in the prosecution of this work, and the reader who can agree to that standard will find himself at a common starting-point with the author. From this common starting-point we may reasonably hope to reach a common end satisfactory and profitable to both.

Having agreed upon a standard of judgment, we have yet to define the main terms that we shall employ in this study.

**TERMINOLOGY**

Endless dissensions have been caused by the ambiguity of terms. Friends have contended with each other and parted as bitter enemies, when, had they stopped to define their terms, they might have ended their contention in perfect agreement. Every living language, like a living organism, is constantly throwing off waste-matter—obsolete words—and taking in reconstructive materials in the form of new words. Words also are constantly either acquiring new meanings or losing old meanings. These constant changes in our language make it especially necessary that we exercise great care in the study and interpretation of our older books.

The Authorized Version of the Bible, for instance, was written in 1611 A. D., and its language is the English of the early seventeenth century. Since that time many and important changes have taken place in our language. It will be necessary, therefore, in the employment of Bible English not only to exercise care with respect to the ambiguity of terms, but also carefully to define words that are obsolete, or no longer

in current use. "Prevent," found in 1 Thess. 4:15, is an example of a word which, though still in use, has an entirely different meaning from that attached to it at the time the Authorized Version of the English Bible was translated. At that time "prevent" meant to precede, or go before; now it means to intercept, to hinder. Another example of a word that has entirely changed its meaning is "conversation" (see 1 Pet. 3:11; Phil. 1:27). At the time the Authorized Version of the Bible was translated "conversation" meant "the general course of conduct or habits," but by a process of contraction in its meaning, it has narrowed to mean colloquial discourse. A valuable table of words obsolete or ambiguous will be found in "Helps to the Study of the Bible," Oxford University Press.

Though the terms employed in the present work are, for the most part, taken verbatim from the Bible, a few theological terms will be found that do not occur in the Bible itself. These theological terms, however, very generally employed by Christian writers, are deductions from the tenor of the Scriptures. It will be necessary to define the meanings of a few of the important

words employed in our discussion and to agree upon these definitions, so that reader and author will attach a common meaning to the terms employed and the reader be thus enabled to understand the author.

For the sake of clearness and brevity, I will use almost invariably one leading term for each phase of the double cure—justification and sanctification—and one term for each negative condition of the heart—sin and native depravity. Occasionally I will use terms synonymous with these leading terms. An example of these synonyms is the word “regeneration,” used as a synonym of “justification.” These words both apply to the first Christian experience, or the first work of divine grace in the heart. Yet the process of justification and that of regeneration are vastly different. “Justification” will be taken as the leading term to represent the first work of divine grace, and “conversion,” “the new birth,” and similar terms will be used as synonyms.

Each work of divine grace in the heart has a negative condition that necessitates that particular work of grace. These negative conditions, like the work of grace that remove them, must have their specific

terms. The following scheme will make clear to the reader our classification of terms, as applied both to the negative conditions of the heart and to the positive works of divine grace.

- I. Terms applied to the first work of grace and to the negative condition that necessitates that work.
  1. First work of grace
    - a) Leading term
      - (1) Justification
    - b) Approximate synonyms
      - (1) Regeneration
      - (2) Conversion
      - (3) Forgiveness
      - (4) Remission
  2. Negative condition
    - a) Leading term
      - (1) Sin
    - b) Approximate synonyms
      - (1) Transgression
      - (2) Unrighteousness
      - (3) Iniquity
      - (4) Disobedience
  - II. Terms applied to the second work of grace and to the negative condition that necessitates that work.

1. Second work of grace
  - a) Leading term
    - (1) Sanctification
  - b) Approximate synonyms
    - (1) Purification of the heart
    - (2) Reception of the Holy Spirit
    - (3) Perfection
2. Negative condition
  - a) Leading term
    - (1) Native depravity
  - b) Approximate synonyms
    - (1) Adamic sin
    - (2) The flesh (figuratively)
    - (3) Carnality

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

*Justification*, Greek *dikaiosis*, “a making right or just; in the New Testament, acquittal, acceptance.”—*Green*.

The Greek verb “to justify” means “to render or regard as just or innocent; justification, as used in the New Testament, acquittal for Christ’s sake.”—*Strong*.

To justify in the evangelical sense means “to absolve or declare as innocent, to ac-

quit a sinner from the guilt and punishment of sin.”—*Cruden*.

*Regeneration* is a change and renovation of the soul by the Spirit and grace of God; the entering into a new spiritual life by means of a spiritual birth.

*Conversion* means a spiritual and moral change of the heart, a change from the service of the world to the service of God.

Though all these terms, justification, regeneration, and conversion, are practically synonymous, there is a slight technical difference between the ideas they present. Regeneration renovates the heart from the moral corruption produced by the transgression of God’s law. Conversion is the change produced by such a regeneration. Justification is the removal of penal guilt. Yet all these are experienced at the time the soul is born again and the sins are forgiven, or remitted, in the first work of divine grace.

*Sin* in its broadest sense is any violation of divine law (1 John 3:4). Imputed sin, or a transgression of divine law that brings guilt to the soul, is a conscious transgression of a known divine law by a free moral agent. (John. 9:41; Jas. 4:17.) Synonyms

of the term are “transgression,” “unrighteousness,” “iniquity,” and “disobedience.” The word “sin” is sometimes used in reference to the sinful or depraved nature of the heart. Such use of the word, however, unless qualified by some such adjective as “Adamic” or “original” is ambiguous and confusing. Even when the word is so qualified, the meaning is not always clear, for the phrase may refer either to Adam’s first sin or to the effect of that sin upon his posterity. In this work, therefore, the word “sin” is used with reference to transgression only.

It is believed that the terms relative to the first work of grace and to man’s moral condition which necessitates that work are, in general, better understood than the terms applied to the second work of grace and to the moral condition of man which necessitates such a second work. These latter terms, therefore, require especial attention.

*Sanctification* is derived from “sanctify.” From the Hebrew *qadesh* “sanctify” means to make, pronounce, or observe as clean either ceremonially or morally. From the Greek *hagios* it means to conse-

crate; to make holy or purify; to venerate mentally, or ascribe holiness to. It comes from the Latin *sanctus*, holy, plus *ficare*, to make. The primary meaning of the word, then, is to make holy; its secondary meaning is to set apart to a holy or sacred use.

The word “sanctification” has a general use and, in the New Testament, a specific use. In general it means the act or process of making holy or pure in any particular, but in its specific use it is applied to the purification from native depravity of the heart of the Christian believer. (Compare John 17:17; Acts 2:24; 15:8, 9; 1 Thess. 5:23.) “Sanctify you wholly” (1 Thess. 5:23), or entirely represents sanctification in its superlative degree, or specific sense. The word wherever used in this work refers to this “wholly” sanctified experience.

Approximately synonymous with the word “sanctification” are such expressions as “purification of the heart” and “reception of the Holy Spirit.”

*Native depravity* means that moral nature in the human heart that manifests itself in a bent or tendency to sin. There are many theories concerning the nature

and extent of native depravity and concerning the mode in which we are made partakers in the fall of the race. Native depravity is variously styled "Adamic sin," "original sin," "the flesh," "carnality." Throughout this treatise the term "native depravity" is employed.

To summarize our principal terms, we have justification, sin, sanctification, native depravity, with their several synonyms.

#### TENOR OF SCRIPTURE VS. A SINGLE TEXT

In the development of Bible doctrines we can not demand that any doctrine be fully established by the use of only a single text. We have, rather, to appeal to the entire Bible, to the tenor of the Scriptures as a whole. In fact, it is unsafe to base a conclusion upon a single isolated text, for other texts often modify and limit the intended meaning of a given text.

Some critics of the doctrine of remaining native depravity in the believer have been imperative in their demand that the existence of such depravity in the regenerated believer be definitely proved by some particular text of Scripture, yet they demand of themselves no such proof for many

things which they most surely believe and zealously teach. For example: it is most difficult to establish beyond the possibility of doubt, by a single text, the doctrine of a divine Trinity. That the Trinity is established by the analogy of faith, or tenor of Scripture as a whole, is unquestioned; but no consistent thinker would affirm that the doctrine is clearly established by any one passage of Scripture. It is true that we are told to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; but the text that tells us this affirms nothing for the unity of the three. Other texts may be found that teach some particular phase of the doctrine of the Trinity, but it takes all the texts relative to the subject, rightly divided and correctly interpreted, to establish the Biblical doctrine of a divine Trinity. The same is true of many other doctrines. Let us, therefore, not demand that any doctrine which we shall have occasion to develop be clearly and fully set forth in any one text of Scripture.

#### THE BIBLE VS. SUBJECTIVE EXPERIENCE

The manifestations of salvation are not all uniform in all persons. Therefore sub-

jective experience, or the so-called "Inner Word," can not be used as a standard of judgment in the study of Bible doctrine. Though salvation is fundamentally the same in all, the ebb and flow of religious feeling is more or less affected by individual temperaments. Hence if we are to have a uniform standard by which to fix Bible doctrines, we must go to the revealed and written Word. Traditions, prejudices, environment, and a thousand other things act upon and vary the emotions. Preaching repentance, justification, and sanctification, in whole or in part, from subjective, or inner, experience has often led to confusion in the teaching of these doctrines. Our motto should be, "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them" (Isa. 8:20).



# THE DOUBLE CURE

OR

## REDEMPTION TWOFOLD

### CHAPTER I

#### Man's Original Purity

What in me is dark  
I lumine; what is low, raise and support;  
That to the height of this great argument  
I may assert Eternal Providence,  
And justify the ways of God to men.

—Milton.

Eden, man's first and divinely prepared home, must have been a place of ecstatic beauty. Flowers must have bloomed beside rippling streams along whose banks grew waving trees and verdant fields. Songbirds must have warbled in the leafy bowers that beautified that elysian garden. Beauties ten thousand more than these that can not be described seemed fitting accomplishments of primal man's physical, mental, and moral perfection.

The Spirit of God had moved on the water that covered the chaotic world, had brought order, life, and beauty to reign on

the earth. Above the newly made and beautified earth stretched the vaulted expanse of the heavens, studded with countless stars and lighted by the sun and the moon. In the production, beautification, and vivification of this mighty earth, in the ordering of the myriad starry worlds, and in the appointment of the mighty ruler of the day and the lesser ruler of the night, the creative impulse of the Almighty seems not to have found a resting-place. Nor could he find, it would seem, among all the then created worlds an object or pattern after which to fashion that semidivine being which was to constitute the climax of his creative effort. So he said, perhaps to the angelic beings, to his divine Son, or to both, "Let us make man in our own image" (Gen. 1: 26, 27).

#### IN WHAT DOES THE DIVINE IMAGE CONSIST?

It has been supposed that man's superiority to the lower animal creation and his dominion over all the earth, being similar to God's unlimited dominion, constitute in man the image and likeness of God. But the likeness of God in man is more than this; for certain attributes of God—om-

niscience, omnipotence, infinite love, and absolute holiness—are mirrored in the personality of man finitely as intelligence, will, affection, and conscience, and without doubt this is all included in the expression “image of God.” But it is evident that the greatest degree of likeness was in the moral nature. In whatever degree the physical and the intellectual may have shared with the spiritual or moral nature the likeness and image of the Creator, it is certain that in the primary sense it was man’s moral nature that was made in the likeness and image of God.

Paul, speaking of the redeemed nature says, “And that ye put on the new man which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” To redeem means to buy back; hence if “after God,” or like God, in the “new man” consisted in righteousness and true holiness, the likeness and image of God in primitive man, back to whose state redeemed man is brought, must have consisted in these same moral qualities.

The New Testament writers state explicitly that through Christ we are redeemed into the image and likeness of God.

“But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the Lord” (2 Cor. 3:18). “For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren” (Rom. 8:29). “Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: because as he is, so are we in this world” (1 John. 4:17). The New Testament abounds in proof that the divine image to which man is redeemed is a state of moral purity. “God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us [Jews] and them, [Gentiles] purifying their hearts by faith” (Acts 15:8, 9). “And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he [Christ] is pure” (1 John 3:3). “Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate” (Heb. 13:12).

## THE NATURE OF PRIMITIVE HOLINESS

There are those who teach that primitive holiness was a superhuman addition to man, and not a constituent part of man's being; but the Bible says that God made man in his own image. The image of God, then, was a constituent part of man, his moral nature, and not a superaddition to man. "Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions" (Eccl. 7: 29). We must distinguish carefully between holiness in nature and the life in holiness. The latter is the result of the former, for doing is the result of being. Primitive holiness, of course, had no ethical value and was, therefore, not rewardable; but it must be remembered that man was placed under a testing law of duty and that by obedience to that law he could live a life in holiness or perform deeds by his own free choice, which have ethical value and are, therefore, rewardable.

Primitive holiness, though it determined man's tendency, was not of such a nature as to interfere with his free moral agency. This is evident (1) from the fact that God

commanded man not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and (2) from the fact that man disobeyed. Had man's moral nature precluded the possibility of an act contrary to God's will, or, in other words, had primitive holiness robbed man of free moral agency, or the power to choose, then it would have been unreasonable for God to give man an alternative between the tree of knowledge of good and evil and the tree of life, for it were inconsistent in God to forbid that which man could not do and to enjoin that which man could not but do.

Neither was the nature of primitive holiness such as to make the grace of God unnecessary. From the fact that the voice of the Lord walked in the garden in the cool of the day we may infer that God often communed with man; so it is reasonable to suppose that man could have availed himself of the grace of God and thereby could have escaped temptation and sin.

Primitive holiness, then, was not some superadded quality of body or mind, but a purity of moral nature that would enable man to live in a state of moral uprightness. Neither was primitive holiness a super-

human power that would force man, independent of choice, to a course of righteous conduct. Man had a physical, a mental and a moral nature. The physical was merely the dwelling-place of the soul; the mental gave him the power of choice; the moral was pure, created upright, in the image and likeness of God; yet the preservation of that holy moral state was made dependent upon man's obedience. Thus, man was started on his probationary career with a perfect body, a sound mind, and a pure heart, with every tendency in his favor.

## CHAPTER II

### Man Under Law

Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.—Rom. 7: 12.

The question has been asked, Why did God put man under law and thus make sin and the fall possible? The question is equivalent to asking, Why did God make a man at all? Those qualities that make man superior to the brute are the qualities that make law a necessity. Righteousness and reward, no less than sin and punishment, are impossible without law.

Love, too, without law is impossible. It appears from God's precepts to man that God created man especially to love Him; the first and greatest commandment of divine law is, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." But love is invariably an act of choice, and choice is impossible without an alternative. Man was permitted to eat of every tree of the garden except one; of that one tree, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, he was forbidden to eat. The word-

ing of the law implies man's power to disobey, and he certainly had the power to obey. By obedience man would prove his love; by disobedience he would prove his disloyalty. The power to sin, therefore, was the unavoidable opposite of the power to love and to obey. Give man power to love, and you give him power to sin; remove from him the power to sin, and you rob him of the power to love.

The institution of the Edenic law was no injustice to man. Man, possessing, as he did, the power to obey, could by obedience secure to himself the highest degree of happiness. To make happiness possible is certainly no injustice, even if the possibility of pain be included; more particularly so if the possibility of both the happiness and the pain, with the way to attain each, is clearly pointed out, and the way to happiness advised.

Everything associated with Eden, man's first home, indicates that man could have secured to himself, by obeying God's law, the highest degree of physical, esthetical, and spiritual happiness. "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had

formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil" (Gen. 2:8-10). The word "Eden," the name of the garden, means "pleasantness." There grew trees to supply "food," "every tree that is pleasant to the sight"; and in the midst, where walked the voice of the Lord in the cool of the day, grew the tree of life. God, seeing that it was not good that man should be alone in the enjoyment of Eden, made "an helpmeet for him," that man's joy and happiness might be heightened by his sharing it with another.

The consequence of disobedience was made plain to Adam in these words: "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, *thou shalt surely die*" (Gen. 2:16, 17). It is indisputable, also, that Eve understood both the law and its penalty; for in her conversation with the tempter she said: "We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the

garden: but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die" (Gen. 3: 2, 3). No injustice, then, was done man by any lack in telling him of either the law or the result of disobeying that law.

Obedience to the Edenic law was most certainly a divine preference. Man, created in the image and likeness of God, was predisposed by nature to obey any law that could come from a divine and holy source. Thus, God made man with an inward advantage in favor of obedience. Disobedience to the Edenic law was, therefore, a free and wilful act of man committed against divine preference and adequate warning. The infinite goodness of God could not prefer the fall and defilement of holy beings created in his own image. As well might we think of his creating man in a state of moral defilement. God could not wish obedience of our foreparents without wishing them the ability to obey. Therefore they must have possessed the power to obey as also they possessed the power to disobey. Disobedience, then, I repeat, was a free act on the part of man. Hence no injustice

could be ascribed to God on account of the Edenic law.

The law of Eden was a testing law of duty, under which man was placed on probation. This probation under a testing law of duty was not only a reasonable economy, but a necessity to man's highest good. Primitive holiness, as we have learned, had no ethical value, for only personal acts of merit can be rewarded; created holiness, therefore, could not be the basis of reward to man. Hence in order that man be rewarded, it was necessary that he have an opportunity of performing deeds of merit, of living a life that is rewardable. But deeds that are inevitable, bound to be done in the very nature of things, have no ethical value and are consequently not rewardable. If man had been given no testing law of duty, he could never have gained a crown. It is deeds done by choice that may be rewarded. Hence the necessity of an alternative—the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Some might ask: "Even if the law was a necessity to the possibility of reward, why should the law have a penalty?" We answer: In the very justice of law every deed

must have its appropriate recompense. Therefore if obedience is justly rewardable, disobedience is justly punishable. It is an axiomatic fact that there can be no law without penalty. The law of Eden, then, with its reward and penalty, was both reasonable on the part of the Creator and best for the created.

We have now learned: (1) That primitive man was a holy being created, morally, in the image and likeness of God; (2) That man was endowed with power of choice and of action, and placed on probation under a testing law of duty; (3) That moral law was a necessity to man's happiness and the purpose of his creation; (4) that obedience to the law and the happiness consequent upon obedience was a divine preference; and (5) That no injustice in placing man under law and no responsibility for man's disobedience can be ascribed to God.

## CHAPTER III

### The Temptation and the Fall

Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit  
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste  
Brought death into the world, and all our woe,  
With loss of Eden.

—*Milton.*

#### THE TEMPTATION

Whether we accept the theory that Satan is a fallen angel or account for the existence of evil beings in some other way, we must admit, if we accredit the genetic narrative, that there existed at the time of man's creation, or soon afterward, an evil intelligence. The story of how our first progenitors were tempted by this evil one through the instrumentality of the serpent is too familiar to demand a detailed repetition here, and too evident from the third chapter of Genesis to need further proof. Even in the literature of many heathen nations is found a narrative similar to the Mosaic account of the temptation and fall. It is probable, however, that these Gentile

traditions were derived originally from the Hebrew narrative.

God was in no way responsible for man's temptation. As we have before seen, the alternative between good and evil was a necessity to the free moral agency of man; for had there been no alternative and man had been incapable of the power of choice, he would have been an automaton, a mere machine. Man's superior intelligence made it possible for Satan to direct his attention to the wrong and to awaken in him a desire for knowledge. The possibility of man's temptation, like the possibility of his fall, was an inevitable consequence of man's necessary constitution.

The possibility of temptation was not an injustice to man, for it must be conceded that to resist temptation was within his power. Moreover, man occupied a vantage-ground against temptation and sin on account of the holiness of his nature and the privilege of association with God. This, again, places the entire responsibility of yielding to temptation upon man. Besides the positive advantages possessed by man, he had been warned of, and evidently understood, the consequences of yielding to

temptation and sin; for God had said, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die."

#### THE FALL

The holiness of man did not exempt him from the possibility of falling. That primitive man, in spite of the holiness of his being, fell from his first moral state, is the testimony alike of human experience and of revealed truth. As we have before noticed, the law was consequent upon man's necessary constitution. Man's happiness and obedience were a divine preference; therefore God was in no way responsible for the sin of our first parents. Primitive disobedience was plainly an act of man's free choice committed against the pleasure and the warning of God and with a full knowledge both of the consequences of disobedience and of the reward of happiness. The penalty of disobedience was plainly stated in the law, which, as we have before proved, both Adam and Eve clearly understood. The reward of continued obedience must have been clear from man's Edenic experience before the fall. In the light of all these facts, no reasonable mind can evade

the conclusion that the responsibility for the fall rested wholly with man.

The fall of man was not, as some suppose, a divine permission as a ground for subsequent redemption. The theory that God did so permit the fall is clearly set forth by Dr. Miley in the following words: "God permitted the fall of man that he might provide a redemption for the race so ruined, and through his infinite grace and love bring a far greater good to the moral universe, and especially to the human race." Paul, viewing the question, would doubtless say, "Shall we do evil that good may come? God forbid." Dr. Miley continues as follows:

"The theory must thus appear in open contrariety to the divine holiness. This result discredits it; for not even the love of God must be glorified at the expense of his holiness. Nor is it within the grasp of human thought that sin, the greatest evil, can be necessary to the greatest good of the moral universe. It is still true that an immeasurable good will arise from the atonement in Christ; but it is not the sense of Scripture that the fall was any part of a providential economy for the sake of that

good. The Scriptures glorify the love of God in the redemption of the world, but ever as a love of compassion for a sinful and perishing world, not as an anterior benevolence which must accept moral evil as the necessary condition of its richest blessings."

Since the doctrine that the fall was a divine permission as a ground for subsequent redemption is contrary to the infinite holiness of God and has no support in the Scriptures, we must discard it as a mere human theory, and adhere to what the Scriptures most certainly teach: that the fall resulted from the free choice of intelligent beings endowed with power to obey or to disobey, and that no responsibility whatever attaches to God on account of the fall.

## CHAPTER IV

### The Nature of the Penalty

The soul that sinneth, it shall die. —Ezek. 18: 4.

Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.

—Gen. 3: 19.

To define the penalty of the Edenic law is to give a simple definition of death, for the law says, “In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” The simplest definition of death is separation—separation from or cessation of life. When soul and body separate, we die. The state of death is the opposite of that of life. Life is produced by correspondence with environment. As long as we eat, drink, and breathe, we live. When we are cut off from correspondence with these, we die. Spiritual life, like physical life, is maintained by correspondence with environment. When we cease to partake of the bread of life, to drink of the water of life, and to breathe the atmosphere of moral purity, we die spiritually. “He that hath the Son hath life; and he who hath not the Son of God hath not life” (1 John 5: 12).

There are three phases of death—spiritual, physical, and eternal—all of which, either immediately or ultimately, are consequences of the fall. God is the source of man's spiritual life. So long as Adam corresponded with God through obedience to the divine law, he retained spiritual life; but "in the day" that he transgressed God's law, he cut off correspondence with his spiritual environment, separated himself from the elements of life; in a word, he died. That man can live and yet be dead seems a paradox, yet such was the experience of Adam. Such, also, has been the unfortunate experience of his posterity. "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" (1 Tim. 5:6). Isaiah said, "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear" (Isa. 59:2). This is equal to saying that sin had killed, for "the soul that sinneth it shall die" (Ezek. 18:4). The death of the soul is not the extinction of the soul, but a separation of the soul from God, the source of its life. Paul said to the Ephesians: "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins. . . .

Even when we were dead in sins, hath he quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved)'' (Eph. 2: 1, 5). Again, he says concerning the Gentiles who walked in the vanity of their mind, or sinful practises, "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their hearts" (Eph. 4: 18).

Death as a penalty of the law seems to have been inflicted in its spiritual phase immediately upon man's transgression, for we readily infer from the narrative in the third chapter of Genesis that man was driven out of the garden soon after his partaking of the forbidden tree; but the infliction of the two other phases of the penalty—physical death and eternal death—was deferred. Though it was "appointed unto man [Adam included] once to die" (Heb. 7: 29), Adam lived physically many years after his transgression; but that he should die a physical death was made clear to Adam in the words, "Dust thou art, to dust shalt thou return."

Eternal death is the most serious and far-reaching phase of the penalty for sin.

It is consequent upon spiritual death, or, in other words, eternal death is spiritual death eternally perpetuated. The infliction of this phase of the penalty was still longer deferred than the infliction of physical death, for eternal death as a penalty for sin will not be inflicted until the final sentence is passed upon the unredeemed millions at the judgment-bar of God. This eternal death, or separation from God in the lake of fire, is called the second death, probably as distinguished from the physical or first death. "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death" (Rev. 20:14). "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death" (Rev. 21:8). Death, spiritual, physical, and eternal, then, is the penalty for the violation of the divine law.

It is a self-evident law of justice that penalty must equal crime. The question arises, then, whether the penalty for Eden's broken law is too great for the crime. Some have thought that the penalty for the break-

ing of the Edenic law was out of proportion to the crime committed.

In determining the greatness of any crime, and consequently in determining its adequate penalty, we employ the rule that the enormity of the crime is governed not only by the motive and the intelligence of the criminal, but especially by the dignity of the one against whom the crime is committed. It would be difficult to arrive conclusively at the motive which prompted our foreparents to disobey God's law. It may have been jealousy injected by Satan; it may have been curiosity or a selfish desire for greater wisdom; but we can not be certain of the exact motive. At any rate, the desires were not legitimate.

That Adam and Eve were highly intelligent does not seem open to doubt; for they were, before their transgression, the undegenerated handiwork of an all-wise and omnipotent Creator. That they knew both of the law and of its penalty we have before proved. Their evil motive, conceived from Satan, their high state of intellectuality, and their holy environment make their crime enormous; but it is the dignity of the One offended that makes

their crime appear in its greatest enormity.

For illustration, a crime committed against an ignorant and obscure slave appears not so great as one committed against an honorable and cultured citizen. If committed against an officer of the law or a state executive, the crime is considered still greater. Probably the most enormous national crime is one committed against the chief executive of our nation. Who would not immediately recognize the difference between the killing of an ignorant person in a backwoods settlement and the assassination of a beloved ruler? Adam's sin was not committed against a fellow being, his equal; it was not an offense to an angelic being, slightly his superior; but his crime, committed in the light of intelligence, was against the infinite goodness, perfect holiness, and adorable kindness of a just and loving God. Viewed in this light, the penalty for Eden's broken law is certainly not greater than Adam's crime.

The enforcement of the penalty, moreover, was inevitable. In the case of a transgression of law, one of three things must occur: the law itself must be repealed; the

honor, veracity, and dignity of the law-giver must be impaired; or the law must be enforced by the infliction of the penalty.

The Edenic law could not be repealed; for, as we have already learned, it was essential to man's necessary constitution. It was enacted, too, for man's highest good. The law of Eden, therefore, was "holy, just, and good." Whatever injustice might have been found in the law after its violation, would have been found before its violation, and before its enactment or institution. We conclude, then, that a law that was "holy, just, and good" could not be repealed by a God who is himself possessed of those same attributes, and that, since no one but God had power to repeal the law, the infliction of the penalty could not be avoided through the repealing of the law.

To permit the law to stand and the penalty to go unexecuted not only would lower the dignity of God in the eyes of his subjects, but would cause God to lie, for he had said, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2:17). Justice could not permit the reflection of dishonor upon God, and God can not lie (Heb. 6:18).

Therefore, since the law could not be repealed and since justice could not permit his dishonor, and since he can not lie, the just penalty of the law—spiritual, physical, and eternal death—was the inevitable consequence of man's disobedience.

## CHAPTER V

### Immediate Consequences of the Fall

Now conscience wakes despair  
That slumbered; wakes the bitter memory  
Of what he was, what is, and what to be—  
Worse; of worse deeds worse sufferings must ensue.

—Milton.

Though the full force of the penalty for Adam's disobedience was not meted out at once, unmistakable consequences of his sin immediately appeared. Adam, as we have before learned, was created in the image and likeness of God. So long as he retained this state of holiness, he would have, on account of the likeness of his nature to the holiness and love of God, perfect fellowship with his Creator. That Adam and Eve had lost the divine image of moral purity and had thereby disqualified themselves for correspondence with God appears from their attitude toward the presence of God. "And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day: and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the

Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. And the Lord God called unto Adam and said unto him, Where art thou? and he said, I heard thy voice in the garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked; and I hid myself" (Gen. 3:8-10). The pointing out by the sacred writer that Adam and his wife hid themselves and that they experienced fear and shame is certainly the basis of a reasonable inference that before their sin they acted differently. Immediate consequences of the fall, then, were a state of moral being that prompted them to hide from the presence of God and a fear of the holiness of God, whose divine image they had now lost.

Passing over God's curse upon the serpent, the multiplication of woman's sorrow in conception, the cursing of the ground for man's sake, and the sending of physical death, all of which were ultimate consequences of the fall, we notice as the second in importance of the immediate consequences of the fall, that God drove man out of the Garden of Eden to prevent him from partaking of the tree of life.

To Adam and Eve the subjective and immediate consequences of the fall were: (1)

loss of the divine image and likeness of God; (2) deprivation of association with God on account of guilt; and (3) loss of access to the tree of life, resulting eventually in physical death.

## CHAPTER VI

### Moral Effects of Adam's Sin on His Posterity

Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth.—Gen. 5: 3.

The use of the words “likeness” and “image” in Gen. 5: 3 is a notable parallel to the use of the same words in Gen. 1: 25. Adam was created in the image and likeness of God; Seth was begotten in the image and likeness of Adam. Had Adam remained in his primitive state of purity, his posterity would have been begotten in the likeness and image of God; but now that he had lost the divine image, his posterity was doomed to be begotten in his fallen image. Some time after the fall, “God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually” (Gen. 6: 5). “Every imagination” in the Hebrew signifies “not only the imagination, but also the purposes and de-

sires," so that the original conveys the idea that the imaginations, purposes, and desires of man's heart became only evil continually. So wicked had man become that "it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart" (Gen. 6: 6).

There is an obvious connection between the conception of Seth in the likeness and image of Adam and the subsequent wickedness of the human family. Imaginations, purposes, and desires that are only evil continually do not spring from moral natures that are pure. "A good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. For every tree is known by his own fruit. For of thorns men do not gather figs, nor of a bramble-bush gather they grapes. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is evil: for of the abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh" (Luke 6: 43-45). This language of Jesus shows unmistakably that the nature of the heart determines the tendency of the life. Reasoning backward, then,

from effect to cause, we can discover no reason for the widespread and deep-seated wickedness of the people before the flood other than a moral lapse of the race.

But native depravity and consequent wickedness are not confined to the antediluvian world. Subsequent history reveals a moral state of men but little better than that of their antediluvian brothers. A writer long after the deluge uses these words: "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psa. 51: 5). Again he says, "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies" (Psa. 58: 3). The phrase "as soon as they be born" is evidently hyperbolical, but it establishes beyond question the fact that man goes astray at a very early age. Upon no other ground can we account for man's universal sinfulness ("all have sinned," Rom. 3: 23) than on that of universal depravity.

The impossibility of righteousness by the law and the imperative necessity of redemptive grace are strong evidences of a moral lapse of the race. Righteousness could not result from the Mosaic law; "for

if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law" (Gal. 3:21). "For the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did; by the which we draw nigh unto God" (Heb. 7:19). If moral and spiritual life had been possible by the law, Jesus would not have said to Nicodemus, that wise rabbi and student of the law, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again he can not see the kingdom of God. . . . Marvel not that I say unto thee, Ye must be born again" (John 3:3, 7). The unavoidable necessity of every man's having to be born of the Spirit before he can see the kingdom of God (John 3:5) presupposes the common native depravity that leads man into sin; for if men were born into this world in a state of moral purity, it would certainly be possible for at least some to avoid the necessity of the new birth, by perpetuating that state of moral purity. The only reason for a universal and unavoidable necessity of being born again lies in the native depravity common to all men.

If the race is morally depraved, we might naturally expect the universality of sin;

conversely, the universality of sin is a strong testimony to the universality of native depravity. Sin is universal, "for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God" (Rom. 3:23). So positive are the inspired writers of the universality of sin that John says in 1 John 1:10, "If we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." Paul, in speaking of both Jews and Gentiles, sums up his argument on the universality of sin in these graphic words: "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin" (Rom. 3:9). By nature we are universally depraved and enslaved in sin; the Mosaic law could not give life; only through Christ can we escape the nature, practise, and penalty of sin.

Aside from the plain and unmistakable statements of the Scripture that sin is universal to the human family, history, sacred and profane, is uniform in its testimony to the universal sinfulness of man. This universal sinfulness can not be accounted for in any other way than by an evil tendency common to the race. Exceptional cases of

individual righteousness, the existence of a good man here and there, prove nothing against the teaching that man is universally depraved. Such exceptional cases can readily be accounted for on the ground that God has been willing in all ages to assist those who seek him. The fact that Enoch and Elijah were translated, so that they did not see death, does not militate against the Biblical statement that it was appointed unto man once to die, and after that the judgment. A position can not be established by exceptions, especially when the exceptions are so few.

The universality of sin can not be accounted for upon grounds other than some inherent tendency common to the race; and tendency is determined by nature; therefore the universality of sin is finally traceable to a native depravity universal to the race. That nature determines tendency is a fixed and self-evident law, a rule which needs no proof other than mere mention to be immediately accepted as truth. An illustration of this law in the lower animal kingdom is seen in the lamb and the lion. Even if we can not fully analyze the cause of the wide difference between the tendencies of

these two animals, we all consent that it is some difference in nature that determines the gentleness of the one and the ferociousness of the other. Similarly, we conclude that sin and righteousness in the human race are traceable to differences in moral nature. Hence universal sinfulness can be accounted for in no other way than by supposing universal depravity.

## CHAPTER VII

### Nature of Native Depravity

My reason this, my passion that persuades;  
I see the right, and I approve it too;  
Condemn the wrong, and yet the wrong pursue.

—*Ovid.*

Native depravity is within us and a part of us, yet it is not a physical entity. A misconstruction of the word “flesh” as it is used in some texts has led some teachers to the erroneous conclusion that sin, or depravity, is located literally in the flesh. Scriptural ideas are best understood when expressed in terms of the more easily comprehended material world. Hence Jesus constantly spoke in parables, and the entire Bible abounds in terms and illustrations borrowed from nature and from domestic and political life. In the study of the Bible we must constantly exercise vigilance to discriminate between the literal and the figurative sense of terms.

The word “flesh,” from the Greek word *sark*, means: 1. Literally, flesh, stripped of the skin; the meat of an animal; the body

as opposed to the soul. 2. Kindred. 3. Figuratively, human nature with its frailties and passions. In several texts in the New Testament, also, it has a figurative sense, meaning the evil propensities of the heart. Paul says: "So then they that are in the flesh can not please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:8, 9). The people to whom Paul wrote were certainly in the flesh, the body, for his letter was addressed to the Romans; yet there was a moral, or figurative, sense in which they were not in the flesh. Again Paul says, "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts" (Gal. 5:24). The sense of both the crucifixion and of the flesh mentioned in this text is certainly figurative; Paul certainly could not mean that the bodies of those to whom he was writing were crucified. The flesh in this figurative, or moral, sense, is represented by Paul as lusting against the spirit (Gal. 5:17). This fleshly, or depraved, nature, which is contrary to the spirit, is the source, or subjective cause, of sin (Gal. 5:19-21). We

must look for depravity, then, elsewhere than in the mere physical part of man.

Neither is native depravity located merely in the will. The will is simply a faculty of mind which completes the mind's power of personal action. All impulses and inclinations are from the sensibilities. We must, therefore, look deeper for the location of native depravity.

We have learned that in the beginning man was created with a physical, a mental, and a moral nature. The question of native depravity does not pertain directly either to the mental or to the physical nature of man, but to his moral nature. The fact that native depravity is metaphysical, below consciousness, and can not be analyzed, does not destroy its actuality. It reveals itself in its activities, and these activities are conclusive proof of both its reality and its evil tendencies. Many things defying complete analysis are yet certain in their reality. To repeat our illustration of the lamb and the lion, for instance, we have never discovered what is the difference between their subjective states that determines the docility of the one and the ferocity of the other. Yet we must acknowledge that

some difference in nature, though unexplainable, gives one the tendencies of the lamb and the other those of the lion. It is likewise a difference in the inner moral condition that is the primary cause for one man's walking after the flesh and another's walking after the spirit.

We might illustrate by the words of Jesus the fact that our inability to fully analyze an inner state does not destroy its actuality: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8). Nicodemus could not understand the operation of the Spirit, since he did not perceive its nature. So it is with those who do not understand the nature of native depravity. But when we fully understand the nature of this moral lapse of the race—that it is a moral state from which arises evil impulses and tendencies—we more easily understand the whole subject of sin and salvation. We read in the moral degeneracy of the race and in the history of the wicked generations that man's moral nature is depraved by the fall.

Native depravity, then, is not of the nature of a physical entity, nor is it an intellectual faculty, but it consists in a condition of moral sensibility that produces an evil tendency in the life. It is located, not literally in the flesh, nor yet in the mind, but in the moral nature.

## CHAPTER VIII

### Extent of Native Depravity

I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.—Rom. 7: 18.

Man's depravity is twofold. We have learned that man was depraved by the corruption of his moral nature, but depravity goes deeper. Men are depraved not only by a lapse of their moral natures, but also by being deprived of the Spirit and grace of God. This latter sense of depravity is known as depravity by deprivation. Some teachers have held the erroneous position that this is the only sense in which man is depraved, but the facts already adduced prove conclusively not only that man is deprived of the Spirit and grace of God, but also that his moral nature is so depraved that involuntary sinful impulses are native to him.

The natural tendency of native depravity in the individual is to influence him toward a life of wrong-doing. But at this point the individual will also figure in the final

result. Now, the will, in its own nature, is free; but it is evident that in its exercise it is limited to the sphere of man's knowledge or environment; hence we can account in this way for the "uniformity of volitions" evident in the fact that at some time or other all men choose to commit acts of wrong, and thus fix their own personal responsibility.

Man is not depraved, however, to the extent that he can not choose the right. The doctrine of absolute and total depravity is the erroneous foundation on which is built the theory of predestinarianism. The propagators of this unsound doctrine think it necessary, in order to establish the sovereignty of God, to hold that man is totally depraved and incapable of free will and choice, and that, therefore, man's salvation is wholly dependent upon the foreordination of God. They teach, in other words, that some men are predestined to be saved, others to be lost.

We have before proved that man was originally endowed with the power of choice. The power to choose between the good and the evil, or ability to perform deeds of moral quality, constitutes an im-

portant difference between man and the lower animal creation. This power to choose and to act constitutes in primitive man free moral agency in its strictest and highest sense. In the moral lapse of man, so evident in the history of the race, man does not forfeit his power to choose the right, but through the practices and habits of sin he does forfeit his power independently to do the right unassisted by the grace of God. This is clear both from many particular texts and from the tenor of the Scriptures as a whole.

“Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are *accustomed* to do evil” (Jer. 13: 23). “For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God” (Rom. 3: 23). But though as a result of depravity and personal sin we have been deprived of the power to live a righteous life, unassisted by the grace of God; there is abundant evidence that we still have the power to choose the right and, when assisted by the grace of God, the power to do the right. Men of every age, tribe, and family have shown in some way their desire for association with God. Whatever their concep-

tion of God and in whatever way they attempt to worship him, all men, from the most uncivilized tribes to the most cultured races, have, in their efforts to find God, testified alike to their power of choice and to their inability to act independently in matters of righteousness.

Some texts explicitly imply man's power of choice. "I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live" (Deut. 30: 19). "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely" (Rev. 22:17).

Man's depravity, then, consists (1) in his deprivation of the grace of God and (2) in a corruption of his moral nature, resulting in evil tendencies. But he is not depraved to the extent of being robbed of free will by which he may choose the right and enter into covenant relations with God.

## CHAPTER IX.

### Theories of Native Depravity

Augustinianism asserts that man is morally *dead*; Semi Pelagianism (or Arminianism), that he is morally *sick*; Pelagianism, that he is morally *well*.

There are three leading theories concerning the extent to which the fall of Adam has affected his posterity. These theories are named after their originators or their first advocates—Augustine, Pelagius, and Arminius. Augustine held the doctrine of native demerit, that all men are, on account of Adam's sin, morally guilty and amenable to eternal punishment. Arminius taught that men are morally depraved, but not guilty. Pelagius taught that Adam's posterity is unaffected by his sin either mentally, morally, or physically.

The theory of Pelagius, that the race is unaffected by Adam's fall, or that we are born into this world morally free, as Adam was in the Garden of Eden, has never had many advocates. Its refutation is written too clearly and forcefully in the history of the race and in the heart of every man to

permit many to believe it. The errors of Pelagianism are too evident and its adherents too few for it to necessitate an extended discussion. The Scriptures unmistakably teach a moral lapse of the race through the fall of our foreparents.

Augustinianism and Arminianism, to the contrary, have received wide attention and an extensive following. Augustinianism has found its two strongest advocates in Augustine and John Calvin. Needless to say, there have been many variations, diverging formulas, and different statements of doctrine even among Augustinians, or Calvinists. Different modes by which we are partakers of Adam's sin and guilt have been advocated, but all adherents of Augustinianism, or Calvinism, whether in its original or modified form, agree that on account of Adam's sin all men are in some way both depraved and guilty. Predestination, the foreordination of some to salvation and of others to damnation, infant baptism, and, in extreme cases, the belief that unbaptized infants go to hell, are all accompaniments or outgrowths of Augustinianism, now more commonly known as Calvinism. The Presbyterian

Church is in our day the principle body adhering to Calvinism. Certain branches of several other denominations, however, are decidedly Calvinistic in their beliefs.

Arminianism is the common foe of Augustinianism and Pelagianism. Arminius denies, in his opposition to Augustinianism, that we are partakers of Adam's guilt, but opposes the opposite extreme also, held by Pelagius, that we are born into the world morally pure. The followers of Arminius, or Semi-Pelagianism, advocate that men, though morally depraved, have the power of choice; that salvation is on condition; and that men may refuse or accept it. They adhere to "free will" as opposed to the Calvinistic doctrine of foreordination. Catholics and the majority of Protestants adhere to the Arminian theory of native depravity.

The Bible teaches the Arminian theory as clearly as it condemns both Augustinianism and Pelagianism. That the race is morally depraved has been clearly proved in a preceding chapter of this treatise. This amply refutes Pelagianism. Augustinianism and Arminianism remain yet to be examined. Since Augustinianism will re-

ceive more extended treatment in the following chapter on modal theories, a few texts will here suffice in disproof of the doctrine of native guilt in the infant heart. "Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me: for such is the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 19: 14). "At the same time came the disciples unto Jesus, saying, Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. 18: 1-3). These words from the mouth of Jesus settle beyond controversy that the child state is the standard condition for entrance into the kingdom of God and that the nature of the kingdom of heaven is like that in which we are born. Certainly no one could reasonably affirm that a state of guilt is the state of the kingdom of heaven or of grace. We must, therefore, conclude that in our native state we are free from moral guilt. Before these texts and many others that might be adduced, Augustinianism must fall.

With the disproof of Pelagianism and Augustinianism, comes the proof of Arminianism. If, as we have proved in former chapters, men are born into the world not morally pure, and if, as we have proved in this chapter, men are not born in a state of guilt, then Arminianism is the true theory, and the race is morally depraved, but not morally guilty.

## CHAPTER X

### History of the Doctrine of Native Depravity

“The doctrine of man’s nature was worked out by the practical Western, or Latin, part of the early church as the doctrine of Christ’s nature was by the speculative Eastern, or Greek, part. The general belief at first was in the inherited or Adamic *corruption* (not *guilt*) of man, and his ability to cooperate with the Holy Spirit in regeneration. Pelagius, a British monk, precipitated discussion by asserting, about 405, that man inherited nothing from Adam, neither original guilt, which was impossible, nor innate corruption, nor physical consequences, as pain and death, which were in the world before Adam. Every man was born free and unbiassed. Augustine in 412 maintained that man inherited not only inborn corruption, but guilt; that he was helpless. Augustinianism first gained the complete ascendancy, and Pelagianism never had any considerable footing. But Augustinianism gradually soft-

ened into Semi-Pelagianism, which was very much the original doctrine of inherited corruption and the power of cooperation. This has remained the doctrine of the Roman Church, as fixed by the Council of Trent after the Reformation. . . .

"The three views were revived at or after the Reformation. Calvin (1536) revived Augustinianism, Socinus (about 1590), Pelagianism, and Arminius (1589), Semi-Pelagianism. Calvin was followed by most Protestants of his century,—Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, etc.—Socinus by the early Unitarians, and Arminius practically by the Church of England (the Romanists being already of the same mind), and formally by the Methodists in the eighteenth century. Since then Calvinism has largely died away and Arminianism now has decidedly the supremacy.

"Pure Pelagianism is made impossible by the facts of habit and heredity. No one would maintain that we come into the world without bias or corruption, amounting often to serious crippling, if not to helplessness. But that men are *guilty* of what they did not originate and can not help, and

deserve God's wrath and extreme penalty, is a doctrine which shows no sign of return. That there is original or hereditary *misfortune*, or moral *disease*, is more clearly seen, but original or hereditary *sin* is an obsolete phrase. That infants are guilty and under divine wrath and punishment, as Augustine and Calvin taught, is a doctrine that no one now can be found to own, scarcely to remember."

—“*A Study of the Sects.*”

## CHAPTER XI

### Modal Theories of Native Depravity

Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.—Psa. 51: 5.

The modal theories of native depravity, or the manner in which depravity is transmitted, is a subject deserving treatment distinct from the fact, nature, and extent of native depravity. There are three modal theories of native depravity that deserve attention. These are the realistic mode, the representative mode, and the genetic law mode. After a brief statement of these three theories each will be examined in the order given.

#### FALSE THEORIES OF THE MODE OF NATIVE DEPRAVITY

The realistic mode of native depravity teaches that in essence we all existed in Adam at the time of his transgression in Eden. From this hypothesis the theory proceeds to genetic transgression and to genetic guilt. In other words, since we all existed in Adam at the time he committed the primitive sin, we, in him, committed the

sin, and consequently we partake of his guilt.

The Bible says nothing about all men having existed in Adam in any such realistic manner. If realism could be established as a reality, to apply it to the mode of native depravity would still be a rank fallacy, as I shall proceed to show. There are two ways to commit error in reasoning —to prove too little or to prove too much. Could realism establish all its claims, it would fall hopelessly into the last error; for if we were sharers in the primitive sin, then we should be equally sharers in all ancestral deeds. We should be guilty not only of Adam's first sin, but of all the sins that Adam and Eve ever committed. Not only so, but we should be sharers in all the guilt of all our ancestors, from the sin of Adam in the Garden of Eden to the last sin of our immediate parents prior to our birth. Such is preposterous, but it is the inevitable result of realism. Furthermore, the very success of the realistic mode of native depravity would prove its utter failure; for there is no reason why, if we were sharers in the primitive sin, we should not be sharers in the good deeds of our pro-

genitors. Hence if Adam repented, we all repented in him, and if he was forgiven, we are all forgiven. Our forgiveness, then, is as real as our guilt. Hence we are guiltless, and the realistic theory of native demerit to the race is a self-confessed falsehood.

There is a lower form of realism, popularly called traducianism. This theory is grounded upon the principle of a germinal, or seminal, existence of the race in Adam. Whether such form of existence included both body and soul is often left without definite statement by the adherents of the theory. Some hold the immediate creation of the soul on occasion of the propagation of the body. In such case the theory is traducian only with respect to the body, and creational with respect to the soul. A most definite statement of the theory is given by Miley: "We say that Adam, being the root and head of all human kind, and we all branches from that root, all parts of that body whereof he was the head, *his will may be said to be ours. We were all that one man*—we were all in him, and had no other will but his; so that though that be extrinsic unto us, considered as particular

persons, yet it is intrinsical, as we are all parts of one common nature. As in him we sinned, so in him we have a will of sinning."

In answer to this theory, it seems useless to any reasonable mind to argue that we could have been guilty in a mere seminal state. Guilt is impossible without personal existence. The same argument might be urged against the lower form of realism as against the higher. If by consequence of our seminal existence in Adam we were guilty of Adam's sin, we are on the same ground partakers of all ancestral deeds. Every man has existed in the loins of his father in precisely the same way as we existed in Adam; therefore if Adam's sin entails guilt upon his posterity, the sins of every father have been entailed upon every child. Thus, lower realism, like higher realism, falls by the weight of its own fallacy.

"The theory [of representativism] is that God instituted a covenant with Adam whereby he was constituted federal head and representative of the race in the primitive probation. This federal headship constituted a moral or legal oneness of the race with Adam; so that the legal consequence

of his conduct under the law of probation, and whether good or bad, might justly be reckoned to them. His obedience should thus be accounted to them as their obedience, or his transgression as their transgression. In this sense the probation and fall of Adam were the probation and fall of the race. Hence the guilt of his sin could be justly accounted to them.

"After the representative headship of Adam, there is still the question of the manner in which all men share his sin. It is not theirs [according to this theory] intrinsically or immediately, as from an actual sharing in the sin, but becomes theirs by a judicial act of divine imputation. This imputation, however, carries over to them neither the act nor the demerit of Adam's sin, but only its guilt as an amenability to punishment."

The principal objection to this theory is that no such headship of Adam and no such covenant between Adam and God is even hinted at in the Bible.. This theory denies a direct sharing of the race in the act of Adam's sin. In this it differs from the realistic mode, and in this respect is more illogical than that mode; for if we had no

part in the act of Adam's sin, yet are made partakers in the guilt of his sin, the innocent are punished with the guilty. Such is plainly contrary to the justice and holiness of God.

What has been said in the examination of both the realistic and the representative mode of native depravity concerning the entailment upon the race of Adam's guilt holds true with respect to the entailment of native depravity. Both theories maintain that the depravity of the race is a penal retribution on account of the sin of Adam, but penal retribution can not justly be meted out except on the ground of demerit or guilt. Such would squarely contradict the principle that no "just constitution will punish the innocent." Any theory that would make native depravity a just penal retribution on account of the sin of Adam must prove that each individual of the race had a part in Adam's sin and is therefore guilty of Adam's sin.

#### TRUE THEORY OF NATIVE DEPRAVITY

The genetic theory is the only true theory of the mode of native depravity. The genetic law was divinely instituted at the very

beginning of life. "God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit, *after his kind*, whose seed is in itself, upon the earth: and it was so. And the earth brought forth grass and herb yielding seed *after his kind*, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after his kind: and God saw that it was good" (Gen. 1: 11,12). It is the determining law of species, and gives us the orderly forms of life. In vegetable life, in animal life, and in human life, the law holds good. The lion, the bear, and the tiger of today are substantially the same as such animals were in preceding generations. The lamb of today is the same docile creature that the young of sheep have been in all ages. Though environment, customs, governments, and religions have made external differences, yet the man of today is, in his constitutional qualities, the same humanity that he has been always and everywhere. This fundamental sameness, universal and abiding identity, can be accounted for in no other way than by the uniformity of the genetic law.

Originally what is now termed native

depravity was not an incipient cause, but a resultant state; therefore, in this sense, it is analogous to the law of heredity. However, hereditary law is generally applied to the transmission of physical and mental characteristics only. Prof. Huxley (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, 9th Ed., Art. Biology) states that, in general, characteristics that are acquired naturally (by which he doubtless means those unaccountable variations that sometimes rise) are transmissible, and tend to become more strongly pronounced in successive generations; whereas those that are produced artificially by mutilation are not generally transmissible.

It is unnecessary to give proof of the well-known fact that in the various departments of organic life variations which have arisen "naturally" have been the means of producing distinct varieties in species—fixed forms, which breed true to their kind.

Now, there is no doubt that mental and moral characteristics are also transmissible, and tend to become more strongly pronounced in successive generations, resulting in a *fixed form*. The introduction of sin into the human family at the begin-

ning produced such a radical change in the moral constitution of man that a race type was thereby fixed. It is reasonable to suppose that Adam's moral state, had he maintained his primeval innocence, would have been transmitted to his posterity. There might have been the lapse of individuals, through whom a distinct sinful type would have originated; but that would not have affected the entire race. But since the fountainhead of the race itself became corrupt, the stream would naturally be corrupt—Adam brought forth after his kind. The penalty of Eden's law was death, and when Adam transgressed that law, he died a moral death, which, as I have shown, radically changed his moral constitution. God fixed the genetic law, but Adam fixed the race type of the human family. Hence we read, "Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son—not in the likeness and image of God, but—in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth" (Gen. 5:3). Job says, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one" (Job 14:4). David says, "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psa. 51:5). From

these texts we may clearly infer the transmissibleness of native depravity.

In applying the genetic law to the transmission of native depravity, some have met the question, "If native depravity is received by transmission, why do the children of sanctified parents inherit depravity?" In other words, "Why is not redemptive purity transmissible on the same ground?" In answering this question we should remember that the transmission of native depravity is the result of the law of Genesis, "after his kind." This does not always include slight variations in the individual. "After his kind" in this case means after the nature of man. Sanctification is received by grace, whereas native depravity belongs to the constitution of man. The salvation of the soul is a miracle. Being, therefore, not a constituent part of the natural man, but something superhuman, divine, and miraculous, salvation, unlike native depravity, is not transmissible by any law.

Even physical characteristics that are the result of accident are seldom transmissible. A man who has lost one arm, for instance, transmits to his children—"after

his kind," not after his own body—two arms. In like manner, sanctified parents beget a child "after their kind," after the race type not after their own natures acquired by grace.

We conclude, then, that native depravity is not transmitted as a penal retribution on the ground of any participation in the sin of Adam either really or representatively, but is transmitted to the race by genetic law, a law to which our natural life is subject.

## CHAPTER XII

### Consequences of the Fall Reviewed

But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

—Rom. 7: 23.

The previous chapters deal somewhat at length with the creation and fall of man and with the consequences to the race of Adam's fall. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the consequences of Adam's fall as they appear in the race to-day. The results of the fall are two in nature—physical and spiritual.

The physical consequences of the fall relate to health and disease, life and death.

It is reasonable to suppose that Adam in his primitive state possessed perfect health and was immune to physical disease. This is not stated in the Bible in so many words; but by reasoning from effect back to cause—from a provision of physical healing in the redemptive plan of Christ back to disease, the only necessity for that physical healing—we readily establish the fact that physical sickness was in some way a result

of the fall. Sickness is in a sense the mere absence of health. We may say, then, that we lost health and incurred disease through the fall of our foreparents.

The ultimate physical consequences of Adam's fall are the loss of natural life and the appointment of physical death (Heb. 9: 27). It would seem that Adam's state in the Garden of Eden was one of conditional immortality. Had he been constitutionally immortal, then it would have been impossible for him to die. But we have learned before that physical death was a part of the penalty to the Edenic law. Hence Adam could not have been absolutely and unconditionally immortal. From Gen. 3: 22, it would seem that by eating of the tree of life Adam might have lived forever. This was equal in a sense to immortality. When Adam sinned, he forfeited for himself and for the race this right to perpetual immortality. "Therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the Garden of Eden . . . and he placed at the east of the Garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life" (Gen. 3: 24). In losing this right to the tree of life, he naturally

incurred physical death, for death is but the cessation of life.

The physical consequences of Adam's fall, then, are the loss of perpetual health and the contraction of physical sickness and suffering; the forfeiture of perpetual life and the entailment of physical death.

The spiritual consequences of the fall, like the physical consequences, are of two kinds. They relate to purity and depravity and to innocence and guilt. Purity and depravity, like health and disease, stand opposed. The one is merely the opposite of the other. Purity is the positive, depravity the negative. In the loss of the divine image—purity, righteousness, and holiness—Adam incurred moral depravity and, as we have learned, transmitted it to his posterity.

Innocence and guilt are to the soul what life and death are to the body. But guilt, unlike depravity, can not be transmitted, for guilt is invariably associated with personality and personal responsibility. It is through the influence of depravity, coupled with temptation from without, that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God."

In the order of reception, disease in the

physical and depravity in the spiritual naturally precede death and guilt. In redemption, however, this order is reversed. In the physical experience we are first healed of our diseases as an earnest of complete redemption, and ultimately delivered from mortality. In our spiritual experience we are first forgiven of our guilt and ultimately cleansed of depravity. Just as the elements of physical disease and disintegration in the physical ultimately result in the death of the body, so the elements of depravity, together with temptation from without, ultimately result in the death of the soul. There is one difference to be noted between the redemption of the soul and the redemption of the body. The former is perfect in this life; the latter, from the nature of things, can not be perfect until death is swallowed up in victory in the resurrection at the last day.

Redemption through Christ meets every human need. What we lost in Adam, we regain in Christ. Thus, we have in the physical, divine healing for disease, immortality for death; and in the spiritual, justification for personal guilt, and sanctification for depravity.

## CHAPTER XIII

### A Double Need

“Let the water and the blood  
From Thy riven side which flowed  
Be of sin the double cure;  
Save me, Lord, and make me pure.”

The preceding chapter outlines the entire consequences of the fall of Adam, physical and spiritual. Since the primary object of this work is to set forth the plan of redemption as it relates to the soul, we shall hereafter dispense with divine healing and the resurrection as not being germane to our present purpose. This focuses our attention upon the double need of the soul and the supply of that double need through the redemption of Christ.

The first aspect of this twofold need appears in a sense of guilt incurred on account of actual transgression of the known law of God. This guilt—the effect of wilful transgression of divine law—finds its supply in that work of grace variously denominated justification, forgiveness, conversion, regeneration.

The second phase of this double need is a need for heart-purity, a need for the restoration to the divine moral image in which man was created. Accompanying this subjective need of a pure heart, a need for the full and unhindered cooperation of the Holy Spirit is felt in the soul of man. This second need meets its supply, as we shall learn hereafter, in the second work of grace, which removes native depravity and permits a full influx of the Holy Spirit.

It will be noticed that there is a reversal in the order in which sin appears in the human heart and in which it disappears through redemption. In the appearance of evil in the individual, depravity precedes transgression; whereas in redemption the forgiveness of actual transgression precedes the removal of depravity. By nature we are first depraved, then guilty; by grace we are first forgiven, then purified.

Following the order of redemption as it appears in the individual experience, we will now study first justification and secondly sanctification.

## CHAPTER XIV

### Justification

Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.—Rom. 5: 1.

Justify, as used in the Bible, means not merely to pronounce or consider just, but to make just. When the sinner meets the necessary conditions laid down in God's covenant with man, God for Christ's sake forgives the sinner and thus renders him justified. There is no power but the divine that can justify the sinner, and no name given in heaven or among men whereby we can be justified except the name of Christ. "It is God that justifieth" (Rom. 8: 33).

The conditions prerequisite to justification are stated in their simplest terms, repentance and faith. Jesus said, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark 1: 15). On the day of Pentecost the convicted multitude asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter, answering, said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission

of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:38). When the Philippian jailer came trembling and fell down before Paul and Silas, saying, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" the prompt answer was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house" (Acts 16:30-31). These texts teach unmistakably that repentance and faith are the conditions of justification. The power to justify is God's; the power to repent is man's. The blood of Christ is God's provision for man's salvation; the act of saving faith is man's appropriation of that provision. When men repent and believe in the atoning blood of Christ for the remission of sins, God for Christ's sake forgives, and the soul is justified, or freed from all its guilt.

Since justification is the removal of the guilt incurred by the transgression of divine law, it follows that for the soul to remain justified the life must be kept free from wilful transgression of divine law. "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4). "Therefore, to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it

not, to him it is sin" (Jas. 4:17). Sin, then, in its broadest sense, is any transgression of divine law, but sin is not imputed unless the law be known to the transgressor. Jesus said to the Pharisees, "If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth" (John 9:41). Sin may be committed either by doing what the law forbids or by failing to do what the law enjoins.

From the very conditions on which the justified state is obtained, from the nature of the process by which the justified state is reached, and from the very meaning and experience of justification itself, we see that the retention or preservation of justification demands a life of obedience to divine law, a life free from sin.

Justification restores the soul to communion with God by the removal of personal guilt. Yet, from the very nature of justification, it can not restore the man to the divine image lost in the fall, for we are not guilty of, or personally responsible for, the existence of native depravity. It remains, as we shall learn, for some other process in the divine plan to remove native depravity.

## CHAPTER XV

### **Native Depravity in the Justified Believer**

I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ.

—1 Cor. 3: 1.

We have before learned that there are many important Christian doctrines which are amply proved by the Bible as a whole, but which can not be fully established by a single text. Those who oppose the doctrine of remaining depravity in the justified believer often insist upon a definite single text in proof of its correctness. Yet they themselves accept without question many doctrines which can not be positively proved by a single text or texts. For instance, every orthodox Christian believes unquestionably in the divine Trinity, yet it is most difficult, if at all possible, to find a single text that proves the divine unity in trinity. Therefore if the Bible as a whole, rightly construed, teaches that there is native depravity remaining in the justified believer,

that doctrine will be as thoroughly established as the doctrine of the Trinity.

**JUSTIFICATION REMOVES GUILT, NOT DEPRAVITY**

Justification, in its very nature, relates to personal guilt, not to native depravity. It were impossible to make one just who was not unjust. Justification, therefore, presupposes the existence of guilt. But personal guilt is not a native condition, but the result of a disobedient act of a free agent. The terms "justification," "forgiveness," and "remission" denote the modes of that experience and point unmistakably to disobedience and consequent personal guilt, and not to native depravity. We have before proved that unregenerate men are both depraved and guilty, that they have a double need. If, then, man is both depraved and guilty, and if justification removes only his guilt, there remains in the justified believer an element of depravity.

It is reasonable that the conditions required for the obtaining of a thing should be such as would lead naturally to the obtainance of that thing. The condition requisite to justification leads unmistakably to the removal of personal guilt, and not to

cleansing from native depravity. Godly sorrow for sin and a conviction of personal guilt can not be based upon a consciousness of native depravity. How can we be convicted for the presence of an element, when we are in no way responsible for its existence? We can not be sorry for our having committed the Adamic sin, for the very obvious reason that we were not present in the garden when our foreparents broke the divine law.

Repentance, another condition of justification, is a turning from sin to God on account of godly sorrow for disobedience. How can we turn from a nature that is native to us, from a moral state in which we were "conceived" and "shapen" (Psa. 51:5)? How gladly would we all turn, in our better moments, from that nature whose tendency is ever downward! When the Ethiopian can change his skin or the leopard his spots, then may we hope to turn, in our own strength, from the evil depravity of our hearts. We can turn from our disobedience, repent of our sins, and be justified from our guilt; but it is impossible to repent of that native condition for which we are totally irresponsible.

In meeting the conditions for justification, we ask pardon for acts of disobedience, not for the existence of native depravity in our hearts. How could we ask pardon for being depraved, when we are in no way responsible for native depravity? However much we may deplore both our depravity and our being overcome by it, we can feel guilt of and ask pardon only for our own personal misdeeds.

The exercise of saving faith by the pleading penitent is for pardon, forgiveness, and for release from personal guilt, not for the removal of depravity. As the penitent cries out, like the despairing publican, "Lord, have mercy on me a sinner!" he does not stop to consider theories, formulas, deep spiritual truths, metaphysical conditions, and profound questions of theology. The feeling of his personal guilt overshadows for the moment every other consideration. It is only in later experience in the light of innocence and truth and hungering for more righteousness that he begins to discover that there is an element of depravity within.

Therefore, since all the conditions lead-

ing up to the experience of justification relate, not to the removal of native depravity, but to the removal of the effect of actual transgressions, justification does not remove native depravity.

That there should be native depravity in the believer is as consistent as that there should remain in fallen man a moral instinct that calls for God and right. As we have before learned, both the Scriptures and human experience prove the existence of moral consciousness in the unregenerate. Paul says that even the heathen, who have not the law, are a law unto themselves; that their consciences shall either excuse or accuse them in the day when God shall judge the world. No heathen tribe, with one or two possible exceptions, has ever yet been discovered among whom could not be found traces of a moral consciousness and a moral responsibility to a higher being. This moral sensibility and religious consciousness, however, is often accompanied in the same heart with the vilest of sin. This proves the existence of a good and a bad element in the same heart at the same time. If this is true of the heathen and unregenerate, why may there not exist in

the heart of the justified believer a dormant element of depravity?

The Scriptures clearly prove the incompleteness of the justified state. Jesus, praying to his Father, said of his disciples, "Keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me"; "I have kept them in thy name"; "I have given them thy word"; "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world" (John 17: 11-16). Surely, there can be no doubt that men of whom all this could be truly said, were justified. Yet Jesus acknowledges the incompleteness of their experience in the words of the seventeenth verse of the same chapter: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." Again, in the nineteenth verse he says, "And for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth."

The first Christian experience of the Samaritans was incomplete. They "with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spoke" (Acts 8: 6). "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women" (Acts 8: 12). Yet

in the following words the incompleteness of their justified state is acknowledged: “Now, when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost” (Acts 8: 14-17). This infilling, or reception, of the Holy Spirit and the purification of heart are simultaneous experiences. In the following words Peter speaks of them as such: “God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith” (Acts 15: 8, 9).

Paul, writing to the Thessalonians, admits a partial but incomplete experience when he says, “The very God of peace sanctify you wholly.” These people were evidently sanctified in part, that is, justified; but Paul wished them to be wholly, or entirely, sanctified. The experience of sanc-

tification, using the word "sanctification" in its broadest sense, begins with justification and reaches its completeness in entire sanctification.

Though at the time when the first Epistle to the Corinthians was written, the Corinthian Christians were not an example of the justified life, Paul's words to them in the third chapter, verse one, prove that they were at the same time both "babes in Christ" and "carnal": "I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ." It is true that their "carnal" condition finally brought about "envy and strife and divisions," and caused them to again "walk as men" (1 Cor. 3:3); but their latter state does not destroy the fact that they were previously both "in Christ" and "carnal."

As we have before learned, the two negative conditions of the unregenerate heart are native depravity and acquired guilt. These are the double need of man and constitute the basis of the double cure. Justification removes guilt, but does not accomplish entire sanctification, or complete redemption. The incompleteness of the justified state, therefore, can consist in nothing

else than a remaining element of native depravity. Hence we say there is remaining native depravity in the justified believer.

## CHAPTER XVI

### Sanctification Defined

“The blood by faith now reaches me;  
In soul and body I am free,  
And now I’ve constant victory  
Since I am sanctified.”

Having learned in the previous chapter that there is in the justified believer a remaining element of depravity, we must now study the deeper experience of sanctification. First let us seek a thorough definition of the word “sanctification” in its use throughout the Bible. Before proceeding to an affirmative definition, however, let us consider what sanctification is not. This consideration is particularly necessary for the reason that many persons have an exaggerated idea of what the experience of sanctification is.

Sanctification is not infallibility. There is much difference between an error in judgment and an error in moral conduct. Sanctification is a purification of the moral nature and an infilling of the Holy Spirit,

not an impartation of infallible judgment. It is true that the presence of the Holy Spirit and the absence of native depravity enlighten the intellect and may assist us in the exercise of good judgment, especially in matters relative to moral conduct and the service of God, but the operations of the Holy Spirit do not so overpower our human intelligence as to result in infallibility.

Sanctification is not absolute perfection. No such experience as absolute perfection is promised in the Word of God, nor has such a state been experienced by any mortal man. Sanctification is of the nature of moral perfection, but does not make us either physically or intellectually perfect.

Sanctification is not of such a nature as to preclude the possibility of growing in grace. It is a qualitative, not a quantitative experience. It removes depravity and sheds the love of God abroad in the heart (Rom. 5:5), but leaves us to grow in grace as long as we live.

Sanctification does not make it impossible for the sanctified to fall from grace. It is merely redemption. Redemption means to buy back. We are bought back to the moral

plane—righteousness and true holiness (Eph. 4:24)—from which Adam fell. If sanctification raised us to a plane where to fall from grace were impossible, sanctification would do more than redemption. It is true that sanctification makes perseverance not only possible but highly probable, yet it does not preclude the possibility of falling from grace, any more than did Adam's holy state preclude the possibility of his disobedience and fall.

Sanctification is not the destruction of human nature. A sanctified man is still a man, not an angel. The taking away of the "carnal nature," as native depravity is sometimes called, is not the annihilation of those faculties and propensities peculiar to a natural man. The sanctified are, therefore, still subject to trials, afflictions, and temptations. Man has a physical, a mental, and a moral nature: sanctification does not primarily affect either the physical or the mental, but elevates especially the moral nature by cleansing it from native depravity and filling it with the Holy Spirit.

There are two aspects of the moral self: man's moral nature is either good or evil. For instance, a man is at one time sinful,

but at another time righteous. The sinful man and the righteous man are the same man, but his moral nature is different. A change has taken place. What has happened? The apostle Paul answers: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2: 20). The "I" that was "crucified" in Paul was the old sinful nature that dominated him when he was a Pharisee; the "I" that "lived" was the better self which lived through Christ. The human self, then, is the evil self when it corresponds with evil, but the same self becomes the holy, living self when the evil is crucified and Christ comes in.

The verb "to sanctify" as used in the Old Testament comes from the Hebrew *qadash*, and means to make, pronounce, or observe as clean, either ceremonially or morally (see Strong's Hebrew-English lexicon). The New Testament word comes from the Greek word *hagios*, and means (1) to consecrate; (2) to make holy or to purify; and (3) to venerate. Our English word "to sanctify" is a derivative of the Latin words *sanctus*, meaning holy, and *ficare*, meaning to make. Its simplest defi-

nition, therefore, is to make holy. A concise definition of the English word is as follows: "To make sacred or holy; set apart to a holy or religious use; to hallow."

More important than the technical etymology of the word is its use in the Bible. To a Biblical definition of the word through its varying uses in the Bible let us now turn our attention. The following brief is, I think, the clearest and at the same time the most concise way to express the Bible use of the word:

#### BIBLE USE OF THE WORD SANCTIFICATION

##### I. In the Old Testament Use—

1. Men are said to sanctify:
  - a) Other men. Ex. 19: 10.
  - b) Temporal things other than man. Ex. 19: 23; 30: 28, 29; Deut. 5: 12.
  - c) The Lord. Num. 20: 12; 27: 14.
2. God is said to have sanctified:
  - a) Men. Ex. 31: 13.
  - b) His name. Ezek. 36: 23.
  - c) The Sabbath-day. Gen. 2: 3,

## II. In the New Testament Use—

1. One text (1 Cor. 7: 14) excepted, no man except Christ is said to sanctify another man or men.
2. One text excepted, temporal or material objects other than man are never said to be sanctified.
3. No man except Christ is said to sanctify himself.
4. Men are said to be sanctified. Acts 20: 32; 26: 18; 1 Cor. 1: 2; 6: 11; Heb. 2: 11; 10: 14, 29.
5. Men are said to ‘sanctify the Lord God in their hearts,’ that is, to regard God as holy. 1 Pet. 3: 15.
6. Husband and wife are said to sanctify each other. 1 Cor. 7: 14.
7. Foods are sanctified by the word of God and prayer. 1 Tim. 4: 5.
8. Men are said to purge, or sanctify, themselves from heretics. 2 Tim. 2: 21.
9. God is said to sanctify:
  - a) Christ. John 10: 36.
  - b) Men. John 17: 17; 1 Thess. 5: 23; Jude 1.
10. Christ is said to sanctify:
  - a) Himself. John 17: 19.

b) Men. Heb. 13:12; 10:10;  
Eph. 5:26.

11. The "offering up," or sacrificing, of the Gentiles is said to be sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Rom. 15:16.

In view of the foregoing, it will be readily perceived that the word "sanctification" has various meanings. Hereafter in the prosecution of this work, "sanctification" will be used in its primary, New Testament sense, meaning to purify or make holy, or in its specific sense, meaning entire sanctification (1 Thess. 5:23). In our study we may find ideas parallel in meaning to sanctification in connection with which the word "sanctify" or "sanctification" are not employed. The idea of sanctification is often expressed in such words as "purifying their hearts," "they received the Holy Ghost." It is the doctrinal idea of sanctification in which we are primarily interested, but for the sake of clearness, the term "sanctification" has been adopted as the uniform word for the expression of the idea.

## TWO PHASES OF SANCTIFICATION

In the experience of sanctification, as in that of justification, there is both a positive and a negative phase. In justification guilt is washed away by the atoning blood of Christ and innocence takes its place; in sanctification native depravity is taken away and purity takes its place. The Holy Spirit also is received in a special sense, which completes the work of redeeming grace. We shall have occasion further to develop these two phases of sanctification in the following chapters.

## CHAPTER XVII

### Christian Perfection

When we speak of Christian perfection, we do not mean a perfection that applies to the physical and mental natures, but a perfection that applies only to the moral nature of man. Physical perfection that is absolute will not be reached until this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality at the resurrection of the just. Concerning this absolute perfection, Paul says, "I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3: 13, 14). The perfectness of the just that Paul here speaks of is the perfection to be attained at the resurrection of the dead. "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead" (Phil. 3:11). Yet there is a perfection to which Paul counts not only himself but also some of

those to whom he wrote to have attained. "Let us therefore, as many as be perfect, be thus minded: and if in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you" (Phil. 3: 15). So there is a perfection to which we shall not attain until the resurrection of the just, and there is a perfection to which we may attain in this life.

Perfection attainable in this life relates to the moral nature of man. "Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God" (2 Cor. 7: 1). Holiness is begun in the justified state and perfected in entire sanctification. Christian perfection, then, is a qualitative idea, and is applied to the moral quality of a Christian's experience. When we speak of Christian perfection, therefore, we mean no such perfection as would make us either physically perfect or mentally infallible.

## CHAPTER XVIII

### Sanctification a Cleansing

“Through all my soul I feel his power,  
And in the precious cleansing wave  
I wash my garments white this hour,  
And prove his utmost power to save.”

Since justification, from its nature and purpose, is not sufficient to remove native depravity, there is an evident need of a further work of grace in the heart of the justified believer. Personal guilt, incurred through disobedience of divine law, is of such a nature that it may be repented of by man and forgiven by God; whereas native depravity is not of such a nature that it may be either repented of or forgiven. Hence some other process than that of justification, forgiveness, or remission is necessary for the removal of this corrupt nature. A careful study of the Scriptures will reveal that only two general methods are employed in redemption. These are justification, or forgiveness, and sanctification, or cleansing. It should not be taken from this that all cleansing is confined to

sanctification, for he washes us from our sins and the guilt of disobedience in his own blood (Rev. 1: 5), just as he sanctifies us by his blood (Heb. 13: 12).

There is danger in the justified believer's remaining in an imperfect state, for the tendency of native depravity is ever downward. The man who penned the lines of the old hymn was conscious of the downward tendency of depravity and of the imperfectness of the justified heart when he said:

“Prone to wander, Lord, I feel it;  
Prone to leave the God I love.”

Jesus was so concerned about his disciples' receiving a more perfect work that he prayed earnestly for their sanctification (John 17). Upon hearing that Samaria had received the word of God, the apostles that were at Jerusalem sent to them Peter and John that the Samaritans who had believed might receive a more perfect experience (Acts 8). Paul earnestly desired the entire sanctification of the Thessalonian believers. Said he: “The very God of peace sanctify you wholly. . . . Faithful is he who calleth you, who also will do it” (1 Thess. 5: 23, 24).

Heart-purity is clearly a Bible-taught doctrine. Jesus said, "Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God" (Matt. 5: 8). Peter said that God put no difference between the Jews and the Gentiles, "purifying their hearts by faith" (Acts 15: 8, 9). Paul said, "Unto the pure all things are pure" (Titus 1: 15).

Since the state of justification can not, from its very nature, remove native depravity; since it is imperatively necessary to the highest success and happiness in the Christian experience that depravity be removed; since the Bible teaches heart-purity; and since cleansing is the only process other than that of justification employed in the work of redemption,—it follows conclusively that depravity may be removed, and that it must be done by a process of cleansing.

In addition to the fact before mentioned, that the verb "to sanctify" means to purify or cleanse, let us notice a few texts that teach the experience of cleansing subsequent to regeneration.

"I am the vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every

branch that beareth fruit, he *purgeth* it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you. Abide in me, and I in you as the branch can not bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit" (John 15: 1-5). The general facts stated in this passage are: 1. Christ is the vine. 2. His believing disciples are the branches. 3. These branches may either be barren or fruitful. 4. The Father is the vine-dresser.

From the foregoing we learn that it is possible for a believing disciple either to be taken away from Christ, the true vine, or to progress to a more fruitful state. The process by which the justified believer, or branch, is made more fruitful, Jesus calls "purg-*ing*." It has been argued by some who wish to carry the literal figure in the spiritual idea, however, that the purging must necessarily be a mere pruning, or outward removal of hindrances to fruitfulness. This objection is invalid. Every particular of the natural illustration can

not always be held to conform to every particular of the spiritual idea it represents. In the interpretation of parables and in the consideration of spiritual lessons drawn from nature, we must look for the central idea, for the fact rather than for the form. The central and spiritual ideas of the passage, simply stated, are: 1. There is in the fruit-bearing branches, believing disciples, some hindrances to their bearing more fruit. 2. This hindrance God himself, the divine husbandman, removes by a process which Jesus calls purging. If there is the difference between the natural and the spiritual idea that the purging is external to the natural vine but internal to the believer it is only because that natural illustrations are often inadequate to express in technical terms every phase of the spiritual idea. Whatever technical objection may be raised to the parallel ideas, the fact remains that as the natural vine is purged to bring it to a more fruitful state, so the believer is purged that he may bring forth more fruit.

Another argument in favor of internal cleansing in this text is that the purging is done by the Father. It is a divine work

wrought in the individual. Then, too, the word "purge," from Greek *hathairo*, when used metaphorically means "to cleanse from sin, to make expiation" (see Green's Greek-English Lexicon and Strong's Exhaustive Concordance). It is highly probable, also, from the examination of the context—the safest and surest means of ascertaining the meaning of Bible words—that Jesus by the use of this word "purge" referred to the Pentecostal experience of the disciples. In the preceding chapter (John 14:17, 26) he speaks of the coming of the Comforter. In the following chapter (John 16:13) he again speaks of the Spirit of truth that was to come. Then in the seventeenth chapter of the same gospel Jesus prayed for the sanctification of his disciples, and not for them only, but for all who should believe on him through their words. Thus, the idea of sanctification, both in its positive and in its negative phases—the purging from native depravity and the infilling of the Holy Spirit—is a continuous thread of thought throughout the fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth chapters of the Gospel of John. John 15:1-5, then, teaches a purging sub-

sequent to our becoming branches in Christ, the true vine, or a cleansing subsequent to the experience of justification.

It is the members of the church, not sinners, who need sanctification, or cleansing. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word" (Eph. 25, 26). In this passage sanctification stands equal with cleansing, and both are accomplished by "the washing of water by the word." Another notable fact brough out by this text is that it is the church, not the world, that is to be sanctified. This is a similar thought to that expressed by Jesus when he said, "Even the Spirit of truth whom the world can not receive" (John 14:17). The world needs justification and the Spirit of adoption into the divine family; the church needs the higher experience of sanctification and the reception of the Holy Spirit in the full and complete sense. Sanctification, then, is a cleansing for the church, or justified believers.

"Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suf-

ferred without the gate" (Heb. 13: 12). The word "sanctify" in this passage may include both regeneration and entire sanctification, the complete redemptive experience. This, however, does not affect in any way the truth that sanctification is a cleansing.

Other texts could be adduced in support of the position that sanctification is a cleansing subsequent to the experience of justification, but the foregoing is deemed sufficient. It is unmistakably clear that sanctification, both from the etymology of the word and from its use in the Bible, means a moral cleansing.

## CHAPTER XIX

### Sanctification a Second Work

Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.

—Tit. 3: 5.

In dealing with the nature of justification and of sanctification, I have shown the distinctiveness of these experiences; in this chapter I shall point out and clarify their distinctiveness. Since the words "justification" and "sanctification" have been previously defined, and since the nature of the two experiences has been clearly set forth, it will now be necessary only to examine the Christian experiences recorded in the New Testament with the view of ascertaining whether or not the perfect redemptive experience was received in two works of divine grace.

The first recorded experience I shall notice is that of the apostles. A careful study of their experience will bring out the following: 1. They were converted before the

day of Pentecost. 2. They needed a more perfect work. 3. They received a second and more perfect work of grace on Pentecost.

Some persons have held that the apostles were not converted before the day of Pentecost. The principal proof-text is Luke 22:32, where Jesus speaks thus to Peter: "I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." An examination of the context clearly reveals the fact that the conversion to which Jesus referred was the conversion that Peter should need after his denial of Jesus foretold in this chapter. In the preceding verse Jesus said, "Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." In the following verse Jesus said, "I tell thee, Peter, the cock shall not crow this day, before that thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me." Peter's fall, as foretold by Jesus, came soon afterward, when he even cursed and swore that he did not know Jesus. "And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me

thrice.'’ Peter’s conversion immediately followed his denial of Christ (Luke 22:62). Some have asked why Peter’s faith failed if Jesus prayed that it fail not. It should be noticed that it was Peter’s courage that failed, and not his faith. That his faith in Jesus was unshaken is manifest by his bitter remorse and sorrow for his sin.

When Jesus appeared to his disciples after his resurrection, he repeated his admonition previously given to Peter, that he should strengthen his brethren, in the words, “Feed my sheep” (John 21:16). We should infer from this that Peter was then converted. As previously mentioned, it is unmistakably clear, also, from what Jesus said of his disciples in his prayer recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, that the disciples were justified believers previous to the day of Pentecost.

The disciples needed a more perfect experience than that of justification. Referring again to the prayer of Jesus in the seventeenth chapter of John, we hear Jesus, after saying of his disciples, “I have kept them in thy name,” “I have given them thy word,” “They are not of the world,” pray to the Father, “Sanctify them

through thy truth . . . and for their sakes I sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth.” It can not be held that this second work, or sanctification, was intended for the apostles only; for Jesus said, “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word.” As we have before noticed somewhat in detail, Jesus taught his disciples to expect a purging that should make them more fruitful. Jesus specifically instructed his disciples to tarry at Jerusalem until they should be endowed with power from on high (Luke 24:49).

This second work, this endowment with power, this purging, this sanctification, prayed for by Jesus was received by the disciples on the day of Pentecost. “And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other

tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2:1-4). This outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the purification of heart were associated as one work by Peter when he was relating to the elders how God enjoined them to preach the gospel to the Gentiles. He said, "God which knoweth the hearts bare them witness, giving them [the Gentiles] the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us [the Jews]; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith" (Acts 15:8, 9).

Were the experience of the disciples the only recorded instance of the two distinct works of divine grace, the argument that the Holy Spirit had not yet been given might seem to militate against our conclusion, but recorded experiences subsequent to the day of Pentecost are parallel with that of the disciples just mentioned. I will notice the experience of the Samaritans, the record of which it will be necessary to quote somewhat at length. "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them. And the people with one accord gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did. For unclean

spirits, crying with loud voice, came of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed. And there was great joy in that city . . . But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women. . . . Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost: (For as yet he was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.) Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost" (Acts 8).

From this passage we note the following facts: 1. Philip preached Christ to the Samaritans. 2. They of one accord gave heed. 3. Even unclean spirits were cast out and the sick were healed. 4. There was great joy in the city. 5. They believed Philip's preaching. 6. They were baptized. These are unmistakable marks of true believers. 7. Sufficient time elapsed for the

news to reach Jerusalem that the Samaritans had "received the word of God." 8. The church at Jerusalem realized the necessity for a second work of grace and "sent unto them Peter and John." 9. When Peter and John reached Samaria, they prayed for the Samaritans, laying their hands on them, and the Samaritans received the Holy Spirit. It is reasonable to conclude that the reception of the Holy Spirit in this and in every other instance, like that experience of Peter preaching to the Gentiles, was accompanied by the purification of heart by faith.

The Christians at Ephesus received two distinct works of grace. "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 1:3). This text makes it unmistakably clear that the Christians at Ephesus received the Holy Spirit, not when they believed, but after they believed. The plain statement of this text is in perfect harmony with the facts recorded in the nineteenth chapter of Acts: "And it came to pass, that, while Apollos was at Corinth,

Paul having passed through the upper coasts came to Ephesus: and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. . . . When Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied" (Acts 19:1-6). These twelve men at Ephesus were disciples of John who had believed on Jesus, but had not heard of the miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit. Paul evidently considered them true believers; for as soon as he had instructed them, he permitted them to be baptized. Then after their baptism Paul laid his hands upon them, and they received the Holy Spirit. So the Ephesian Christians first believed and afterward were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise.

From the first chapter of Paul's letter to the Thessalonians we learn that, though the Thessalonians had labored in love, were patient in hope, were elect of God and called of the Lord, and were ensamples to all that believed in Macedonia and Achaia, yet Paul perceived that they still had need of entire

sanctification, for he said to them in the fifth chapter, "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is he that calleth you who also will do it" (1 Thess. 5: 23, 24).

Texts might be multiplied in proof of the doctrine of sanctification subsequent to justification; but these four instances are clear and, on the whole, parallel, uniform, and unmistakable in their teaching. This doctrine of a second distinct work of grace agrees also to what we have learned of man's moral need and nature. Sanctification as a second work is a completing of the supply of man's double need, a climax of the double cure.

The length of time that may elapse between the obtaining of justification and of sanctification is irrelevant. Whether sanctification follows justification by only a few minutes or by a few years does not affect in any way the nature and distinctiveness of the two experiences. Naturally, it is desirable that entire sanctification should follow justification as soon as the heart feels its need and

the mind comprehends the mode of the perfect experience. Since the second work is somewhat dependent upon the consciousness of the need, the comprehension of its availability, and the active faith of the individual, no rule can be laid down as to how much time should intervene between the two experiences. In short, the time element in the two works of grace is not a matter of doctrine, but one of experience.

The doctrine of two distinct works of grace has been objected to upon the ground of a supposition that God never does things by halves. In answer to this objection we may refer to the blind man of Bethsaida (Mark 8: 22, 25). When Jesus had spit on his eyes and laid his hands upon him, the blind man saw men as trees walking, was partly restored; again Jesus touched him and he saw all men clearly, was fully restored. This incident of healing has, of course, no relation to the twofold plan of the soul's salvation; but it does most conclusively prove that God may and does, for reasons of his own, sometimes do in two parts things which he could, if he pleased, do in one act. The forgiveness of personal transgression and the removal of native

depravity, however, are not two halves of a whole, but two distinct works, differing in nature and requiring different treatment.

## CHAPTER XX

### Sanctification a Reception of the Holy Spirit

One phase of the doctrine or of an experience is often accentuated to the detriment of another equally important phase. This has been sometimes done with respect to the doctrine of sanctification. Some have stressed the cleansing aspect to the neglect of the infilling aspect. Sanctification is, as we have before learned, a cleansing from native depravity, but it is none the less a reception of the Holy Spirit and an endowment with power.

Such phrases as "the Holy Ghost fell on them," "the gift of the Holy Spirit," "they received the Holy Spirit," and "the Holy Spirit came upon them" are in the Bible used interchangeably in speaking of this positive aspect of the second work of grace. Some teachers have tried to make the gift of the Holy Spirit and the reception of the Holy Spirit two different experiences. In Acts 10: 44-47, however, Peter uses the expressions, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them

which heard the word," "on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost," and "have received the Holy Ghost," in referring to the one experience of the house of Cornelius. By the words "Gentiles also" in verses 45 and the words "as well as we" in verse 47, he makes the experience of the house of Cornelius equal with that of the disciples on the day of Pentecost. Of the disciples on the day of Pentecost it is said, "They were filled with the Holy Ghost." Therefore the falling of the Holy Spirit upon men, the pouring out of the gift of the Holy Spirit, and the filling with the Holy Ghost are different terms applied to one and the same experience. It is evident from Peter's words in Acts 15: 8, 9, before quoted, that the reception of the Holy Spirit is simultaneous with the purification of heart.

It has been questioned whether Cornelius was in a state of justification before Peter's visit recorded in the tenth chapter of Acts. If Cornelius was not justified, or living to the degree of moral and spiritual light that he possessed, he was not, of course, in a condition for the reception of the Holy Spirit as a second work of grace; but it

is evident from Luke's description in Acts 10: 1-8 that Cornelius, though a Gentile, had in some way been converted to the true God. It is said of him, moreover, that he was "a devout man and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway" (Acts 10: 2). The Lord honored his prayers sufficiently to send an angel to him (Acts 10: 3). At the sight of the angel Cornelius proved the attitude of his heart by saying, "What is it, Lord?" In answer to his question the Lord said, "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God" (Acts 10: 4). Cornelius further proved his attitude toward the Lord by immediately selecting two devout soldiers and sending them to Joppa to seek Peter, according to the instructions of the Lord. There is a striking parallel, also, between Cornelius' attitude of mind and heart and that of the disciples at Pentecost. Both were in an attitude of fervent prayer, the prayers of both were regarded by the Lord, and both were miraculously filled with the Holy Spirit. We conclude, then, that the reception of the Holy Spirit by the house of Cornelius combined the purifica-

tion of their hearts (Acts 15: 8, 9) and entire sanctification.

When Paul went to Ephesus (Acts 19), he found there certain disciples who, though they had believed, had not even heard of the miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit and had, of course, not received the Holy Spirit. These twelve men, then, were believing disciples (Acts 19: 7), but they had not received the Holy Spirit. After listening to the instructions of the apostle Paul, these men, who were evidently the disciples of John, were rebaptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied" (Acts 19: 6). So we conclude that the reception of the Holy Ghost is subsequent to the act of faith that makes us believing disciples of Christ. This distinction between conversion and the reception of the Holy Spirit will appear more fully in the following chapter.

There are three distinct office-works of the Holy Spirit. His first office-work is "to convict and reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of

righteousness, because I go to my Father and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged" (John 16:8-11). His second office-work is to act as a witness of sonship to the believers. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God" (Rom. 8:14, 15, 16). The third office-work is to sanctify the believer and to endue him with power from on high. "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you" (Acts 1:8). "They were all filled with the Holy Ghost" (Acts 2:4). "They received the Holy Ghost" (Acts 8:17).

Because the Bible teaches the reception of the Holy Spirit subsequent to regeneration, we should not conclude that the justified do not possess the Holy Spirit in any sense; for Paul says, "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Rom. 8:9), and "His Spirit beareth witness with our spirit that we are the chil-

dren of God" (Rom. 8: 16), and, "We know that he abideth in us by the Spirit which he hath given us." It has been explained that the Holy Spirit comes *to* the sinner to convict him, goes *with* the justified, and dwells *in* the sanctified. We should think of the Holy Spirit's relationship to us, however, not in terms that relate to space, position, or quantity, but in terms of spiritual relationship. It is sufficient, then, that the Holy Spirit bears a certain relation to the sinner; namely, that of a convictor; that he bears a far closer relation to the justified; and that he bears the closest relation of all to the wholly sanctified.

A comparison between the relation of evil spirits and of the Holy Spirit to the soul makes clear these three degrees of relationship. An evil spirit bears the same relation to the saint that the Holy Spirit bears to the sinner: the evil spirit is opposed to the moral condition and attitude of the saint; the Holy Spirit reproves the sinner for his sins. An evil spirit bears the same relation to an ordinary sinner that the Holy Spirit bears to the justified believer: the evil spirit influences and controls the sinner just as the Holy Spirit

influences and controls the justified believer. An evil spirit bears the same relation to a demoniac that the Holy Spirit bears to the wholly sanctified: the evil spirit possesses the demoniac, and the Holy Spirit possesses and fills the wholly sanctified. The nature of these compared relations is, of course, opposed, but the degrees of relationship are parallel.

Though the moral tendency of the Holy Spirit is uniform in all lives, the outward manifestations of his presence are not uniform. The recorded instances of the reception of the Holy Spirit show this difference in the manifestations of his presence. In some instances the reception of the Holy Spirit was accompanied by a miraculous gift of tongues (see Acts 2:4; 19:6). In other instances it is merely said that "they received the Holy Ghost" (Acts 8:17); nothing is said of their having spoken in other tongues. Just as in the experience of forgiveness the outward manifestations may be varied by the temperaments of the believers, so in the reception of the Holy Spirit the external manifestations may be varied by the circumstances and the temperaments of the sanctified.

## CHAPTER XXI

### Mode of Sanctification

To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.

—Acts 26: 18.

By the mode of sanctification is meant the method or the process by which that experience is attained. The principal question to be considered is: Is sanctification attained gradually, by a growth, or is it, like justification, attained by an instantaneous act of faith?

We have before learned that sanctification is a qualitative experience; that it affects the nature of man, purifying him from native depravity and filling him with the Holy Spirit. Growth is a quantitative action; that is, it changes the proportion and the quantity, but never changes the nature. The small oak, for instance, never grows into a chestnut. One hundred years of growth changes the proportion of the little oak, but does not change its nature.

Some years of growth may change the quantity and the strength of our graces, but not their nature. There is a difference between growth *in* grace and growth *into* grace. The former is possible, the latter impossible. Culture may modify conscious habits and produce a high degree of self-control, but it can never change the nature. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin or the leopard his spots? Then may ye also do good that are accustomed to do evil" (Jer. 13: 23). There may be a growth in grace, an advancement in spiritual life approaching the state of sanctification, just as there is progress toward the experience of regeneration; but sanctification, like regeneration, must be an instantaneous act of faith and an instantaneous work of divine grace.

The provisions for sanctification indicate an instantaneous work. We are sanctified by God the Father (Jude 1). God is the author of the sanctified experience; it is not, as we have before learned, the product of growth or of moral culture. If it is from God, then we must receive it by faith. Hence we read, "sanctified by faith" (Acts 26: 18). "Wherefore Jesus also,

that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate" (Heb. 13:12). Sanctification, like justification, is accomplished by God the Father through the truth, by faith, and with the blood. We do not grow into the experience of adoption, nor do we attain divine experience by ethical culture. We are enlightened through the gospel, which is the power of God unto salvation. We exercise faith in God, and the atoning blood cleanses first our guilt then our depravity. Each is an instantaneous divine work wrought in the heart by an act of faith.

## CHAPTER XXII

### Sanctification Attainable in This Life

Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.  
—Matt. 5: 8.

Biblical expositors take in general, three positions concerning sanctification: (1) that sanctification is not a second work; (2) that sanctification is not attainable until death; and (3) that sanctification is a second work and is attainable in this life. That sanctification is a second work we have before conclusively proved. This refutes the theory that entire sanctification is attained in regeneration. By proving that sanctification is attainable in this life, I shall refute the position that it is never attained until death.

That sanctification is attainable in this life will appear from the following reasons:

1. Whatever inspired men have prayed that we might attain is attainable. Jesus prayed for the sanctification of his disciples, and not for them only, but for all those who should believe on him through the words of his disciples (John 17: 17-20).

Paul prayed that the Thessalonians might be "wholly sanctified" (1 Thess. 5: 23). To confirm in their minds the certainty of the answer to his prayer, he said, "Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it" (1 Thess. 5: 24). No reasonable person would conclude that either Jesus or Paul was praying for an attainment to be realized at death or in the future life. Moreover, the prayer of Jesus was definitely and fully answered with respect to his immediate disciples by the Pentecostal experience (compare Acts 2: 1-4 and Acts 15: 8, 9).

2. Whatever other men under like circumstances with us have attained we may hope to attain, for God is no respecter of persons. "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth to them that *are sanctified*" (1 Cor. 1: 2). Jude, the brother of James, wrote to certain persons who were at that time sanctified: "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that *are sanctified* by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called" (Jude 1). "For by one offering he *hath* perfected forever them that *are sanctified*" (Heb. 10: 11). It can not be denied that the Corinthians, the Hebrews, and those

Christians to whom Jude wrote, were living men. Those who believe that sanctification is not attainable until after death are driven to the absurd position that Corinth was not a city in Greece, but a place of departed spirits; that the Hebrews were not living men; and that the letter of Jude was addressed to the dead.

It is a generally accepted truth that all for whom Jesus died may have all for which he died. Jesus tasted death for every man (Heb. 2:9). Jesus died to sanctify the people with his own blood (Heb. 13:12). Therefore the people, every man, may be sanctified. And all that comes to us through the blood must come in this life, for "there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood" (1 John 5:8). We conclude, therefore, that all men may be sanctified in this life.

## CHAPTER XXIII

### Who May Have Sanctification?

For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.—Acts 2: 39.

The penitent sinner can not, from the very nature of the case, comprehend the need and the nature of sanctification. He is too much absorbed with the feeling of his own guilt and the need of forgiveness to comprehend his need of cleansing from native depravity. It is after an acquaintance with God and a more intimate acquaintance with his own moral nature and with the plan of redemption that he feels the need of a “more abundant life” (John 10: 10), comprehends the nature and the existence of depravity, and longs for the complete infilling of the divine Spirit.

It was after the disciples at Ephesus had believed that they were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. “In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed

with that Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. 1:13).

Again, the Holy Spirit is given to the obedient (Acts 5:32). The disobedient need justification; the obedient may be sanctified. God gives the Holy Spirit to those who ask (Luke 11:9-13). It is probable that the miraculous descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost found the disciples in prayer (Compare Acts 1:14 and Acts 2:1).

To sum up, then, it is the justified believer, whose sins have been forgiven, the soul who has become acquainted with divine things, the obedient who ask and believe, that may be sanctified.

## CHAPTER XXIV

### The Value of Sanctification

Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.—Acts 1: 8.

Sanctification is the crowning work in the plan and the experience of salvation; it completes and perfects the graces begun in justification, by the removal of native depravity and by the bestowment of divine power.

That man was originally pure we have before learned. Redemption means to buy back; therefore redemption in its highest sense means the restoration of moral purity. Thus, sanctification restores to us that valuable treasure, moral perfection, lost through the sin of our foreparents. Sanctification brings us back morally to Eden and makes us to partake of the tree of eternal life, for Christ brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (2 Tim. 1: 10).

Sanctification not only frees us from the innate depravity of the race, but also en-

dows us with divine power. Jesus said to his disciples, "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." Who of us has not, while in the justified experience, felt the need of this endowment with power? It is only by the power of the Holy Spirit that we can truly succeed in our struggle against sin and in our service to God. Loss of Eden and of the divine image robbed man of moral power and enslaved him to sin. Salvation releases man from bondage, restores the divine image, and endows him with power from on high. This power of the Holy Spirit not only imparts the power to live holy, but inspires us in preaching the gospel of deliverance to others. "Unto you by them that have preached the gospel unto you with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven" (1 Pet. 1:12).

In addition to purifying us from depravity and imparting to us divine power, the experience of sanctification brings us into possession of the Holy Spirit, who is our divine guide. "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance,

whatsoever I have said unto you" (John 14:26). "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth" (John 16:13).

In neglecting the doctrine and experience of sanctification, some pastors have failed to bring their members to an established experience of purity, power, and divine guidance. The question has been asked by the earnest inquirer and urged by the observant critic, Why do so many persons make a failure of the Christian life? The answer to this question is not far to seek. The justified believer is very often not led on to the state of perfection in sanctification. After the first glow of conversion has been dimmed by trials and temptations, very often the newly converted, tempted by Satan as well as by the world, and impelled by his own depravity, falls back into the sinful life. The deeper consecration in the sanctified life, the purity of heart and the endowment with power belonging to that experience, are the seal and preservation of a Christian experience, the crown and glory of redemption.

## CHAPTER XXV

### How to Obtain Sanctification

The doctrine of sanctification, however well understood, is of little value unless it leads us to the heart-experience of sanctification. The atonement was made for all men, but it avails only for those who by an act of personal faith appropriate the boundless blessings it affords. Yet an understanding of the doctrine of sanctification and a knowledge that the atoning blood of Christ will purify the heart and fill it with the divine Spirit are necessary to our obtaining the experience. A man who, like the disciples at Ephesus, has never heard "whether there be any Holy Spirit," can not be filled with the Holy Spirit. Though a man may receive sanctification without first understanding technically and thoroughly every phase of the doctrine, yet he must have sufficient knowledge to know that sanctification is a Bible doctrine. He must, for example, know that there is such a thing as sanctification, that it is attainable in this life, and that it is for him.

The knowledge of the doctrine of sanctification is fruitless without a fervent desire for the experience. A fervent desire for a pure heart, guided by a knowledge of God's provision through the gospel, will beget sanctifying faith in the believer, will set him to praying, seeking, striving for the perfect salvation experience. Since a man can not intelligently desire that of which he is ignorant, enlightenment must precede desire; but, unfortunately, fervent desire does not always follow enlightenment. A man must not only *know* the nature and tendency of depravity, *know* that its eradication is possible and that he must also *feel* the dangers of allowing the depraved nature to remain in him, and *feel* the desirableness, the profitableness, the blessedness, yea, the necessity, of a sanctified experience.

Both the intellect and the sensibility, knowledge and feeling, then, have a part in the Christian experience. Jesus says, "Ye shall *know* the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). Yet the kingdom of God is partly feeling, for Paul says it is "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 14:17). Knowl-

edge without fervent desire may take a man through a formal consecration and lead him to a profession of sanctification; but without fervent desire to propel the heart to action the religious sensibilities remain dormant, the faith is not a living faith, and the experience is not perfect. The necessity of feeling, desire, conviction, however, does not make knowledge unnecessary. The intellect and the sensibilities in Christian experience stand related like body and soul in man. As the body without the soul is dead, so knowledge without feeling is lifeless and cold; as the soul without the body is insensible and incapable of practical earthly life, so feelings without the guiding power of knowledge are unstable and unenduring. We receive knowledge of sanctification through the truth (John 17:17), but desire is the wings that waft our prayers to God and bring a speedy answer down. "Whatsoever things ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them" (Mark 11:24). It is the "*fervent* prayer," the prayer that burns with holy desire, that "*availeth much*" (Jas. 5:16).

Even though God understands our faint-

est desire as well as he understands our spoken request, yet it pleases him—to say nothing of the good it does us—to have us ask. “Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you: for every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened” (Matt. 7: 7, 8). It appears from the following texts that the disciples were in prayer when the Holy Spirit descended upon them on the day of Pentecost. “And when they were come in, they went up into an upper room, where abode both Peter, and James, and John, and Andrew, Philip, and Thomas, Bartholomew, and Matthew, James the son of Alphæus, and Simon Zelotes, and Judas the brother of James. These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren” (Acts 1: 13, 14). “And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as

of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Acts 2: 1-4). It was while in prayer that the disciples on another occasion were filled with the Holy Spirit. "And when they had prayed, the place was shaken where they were assembled together; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and they spake the word of God with boldness" (Acts 4: 31). Prayer was offered, too, when the people of Samaria received the Holy Spirit. "Now when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John: Who, when they were come down, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost" (Acts 8: 14, 15). Jesus says plainly that the Holy Spirit is given to them that ask. "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children: how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" (Luke 11: 13)

Knowledge, desire, and prayer, though necessary, are still not enough to cleanse the human temple in the blood of Christ

and thus fit man for the Holy Spirit's complete indwelling. There must be a fuller dedication of oneself to God than was possible before conversion. The convicted sinner who has never known Christ as his Savior can not fully comprehend the deep meaning of an entire consecration, but the justified believer who has 'acquainted himself with God' understands more fully what it means to give spirit, soul, and body completely and unreservedly into the hands of God. Whether or not Paul had in mind entire sanctification when he wrote the words of Rom. 12: 1, that verse expresses the idea of complete surrender of the body to the service of God. In his letter to the Thessalonians Paul speaks of sanctifying as being done "wholly," or entirely, and of the preserving grace of God as reaching "spirit, soul, and body." "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ. Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it" (1 Thess. 5: 23, 24).

“When thy all is on the altar laid,  
Guard it from each vain desire;  
When thy soul the perfect price has paid,  
God will send the holy fire.”

But we are not sanctified by knowledge, by desire, by prayer, nor by dedication or consecration. Not even by all of these necessary steps are we sanctified. “Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate” (Heb. 13:12). The apostle Paul says that he was sent to the Gentiles “to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me” (Acts 26:18).

To sum up what we have thus far learned, the justified believer must, in order to be sanctified, receive a knowledge that sanctification is attainable, must have an impelling desire to obtain the experience, must dedicate, or consecrate, himself “wholly to God,” must pray for the Holy Spirit and, finally, must believe, must have faith that the blood cleanses and that the Holy Spirit in his fulness comes in.

Just at the "faith point," however, is where many falter. We are sensation-loving creatures. We often think more of the blessing and pray more for the blessing than we do for the Blesser. Sanctification by faith, the only sanctified experience known in the Bible, is often overlooked through overattention to feelings, demonstrations, and mere externalities. Reader, if you wish to be sanctified, you must receive that experience by faith. Feelings, blessings, and glory are not the heralds of faith, but the fruits of faith. Emotions have their seat in the human mind and are played upon by all kinds of circumstances; they vary, rise and fall: but faith is grounded upon the immutable word of God; it continues unmoved and unchanged by varying circumstances and changing environment.

Some people trouble themselves a great deal about "the witness" of sanctification; yet, in truth, "the witness" is the one thing about which man need never trouble himself. Man's part is to believe, the Spirit's part is to witness; so see that you believe, and let God attend to the witnessing, for "he that believeth hath the witness in him-

self" (1 John 5:10). Some latter-day teachers would have us believe that the gift of tongues is a necessary accompaniment, or witness, of the Holy Spirit's infilling. Such a position is refuted by the experience of the Samaritans. In the account of their receiving the Holy Spirit nothing is said about their having spoken in tongues. Read Acts 8:5-17. Other scriptures also refute the above position.

To put the instructions in few words: if you are a justified believer in Christ, desiring to be wholly sanctified, you must believe that sanctification is for you and is obtainable in this life; you must desire it fervently enough to prize the experience above everything else, to seek it diligently, to pray for it earnestly; you must dedicate your spirit, soul, and body forever to the service of God; finally, you must believe—unwaveringly believe, regardless of mere emotions, that the blood sanctifies, that the Holy Spirit comes in. Do these things from the heart, and you are sanctified. Doubts may assail you, temptations may come, emotions may rise and fall, but "he that believeth hath the witness in himself."









T2-BE1-112

